

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 156 453

SE 024 368

TITLE A Survey of Public and Leadership Attitudes Toward Nuclear Power Development in the United States. Study No. 2515.

INSTITUTION Harris (Louis) and Associates, Inc., New York, N.Y.

SPONS AGENCY Ebasco Services Inc., New York, N.Y.

PUB DATE Aug 75

NOTE 150p.; For related document, see SE 024 369

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.83 HC-\$7.35 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Attitudes; Economics; Energy; *Energy Conservation; Environmental Education; *National Surveys; Natural Resources; Politics; Pollution; *Public Opinion; *Surveys; *Utilities; Waste Disposal

IDENTIFIERS *Nuclear Power

ABSTRACT

This publication details a study done by Louis Harris and Associates in 1975 to assess attitudes toward nuclear power in the United States. The survey consisted of three parts. The first part was in-person, door-to-door interviews with 1,537 scientifically selected households nationwide. The second part was 301 personal interviews, about 1 hour long, with neighbors of nuclear power plants in three areas of the country. The third part was personal interviews with 201 political, business, environmental, and regulatory agency leaders in the nation. Interview questions and data, discussions of each section of the study, and a general summary are included. Some of the topics examined are the advantages and disadvantages of nuclear energy, waste disposal, pollution problems, safety, and economics of nuclear power. Attitudes toward increasing numbers of nuclear power plants, confidence in utility company management and in environmentalists, trust in the news media, and financing nuclear development were also surveyed. It should be noted that this study predates the natural gas and coal shortages of 1976-78. (MR)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *

* from the original document. *

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Ebasco Services, Inc.

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND
USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

**A SURVEY OF
PUBLIC AND LEADERSHIP ATTITUDES
TOWARD NUCLEAR POWER DEVELOPMENT
IN THE UNITED STATES**

CONDUCTED FOR
EBASCO SERVICES INCORPORATED
BY
LOUIS HARRIS AND ASSOCIATES, INC.

August 1975

ED156453

SE 024 368

A SURVEY OF
PUBLIC AND LEADERSHIP ATTITUDES
TOWARD NUCLEAR POWER DEVELOPMENT
IN THE UNITED STATES

Conducted for
EBASCO SERVICES INCORPORATED

August 1975

by
LOUIS HARRIS AND ASSOCIATES, INC.

Organizations wishing to reprint this study are granted permission to do so. Please send a copy to Manager, Corporate Communications, Ebasco Services Incorporated, Two Rector Street, New York, New York 10006.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
SUMMARY.....	1
Methodology.....	v
SECTION I: ENERGY SHORTAGES: TODAY AND TOMORROW..	1
SECTION II: THE BALANCE SHEET FOR NUCLEAR ENERGY..	32
Disadvantages of Nuclear Energy.....	33
Problems of Waste Disposal.....	36
Escape of Radioactivity.....	37
Danger of Explosion or Accident.....	38
Thermal Pollution.....	39
Air Pollution.....	39
Sabotage or Plutonium Theft.....	40
Safety of Nuclear Power Plants.....	41
Advantages of Nuclear Energy.....	45
Cheaper Source of Energy.....	46
Polluting Effects of Nuclear Energy.....	47
Unlimited Source of Energy.....	49
Independence From Foreign Sources.....	50
Efficiency of Nuclear Plants.....	51
Health Hazards and Risks.....	51
Risks Worth Taking.....	52
SECTION III: NUCLEAR POWER IN OWN COMMUNITY.....	76
More Nuclear Plants in the United States.....	77
Nuclear Power In Own Community.....	81
The Economic Dimension of Nuclear Power.....	87
SECTION IV: IMPACT OF INSTITUTIONS AND INDIVIDUALS ON NUCLEAR POWER.....	103
Trust in the Media.....	106
Influence of Friends and Critics of Nuclear Energy.....	106
Confidence in Electric Power Companies.....	108
The Pollution Issue.....	110
Financing Nuclear Development.....	111
Role of Government in Nuclear Energy.....	112

SUMMARY

This report presents the findings of a major survey conducted by Louis Harris and Associates for Ebasco Services Incorporated. The study was designed as a measure of attitudes of the public and their leaders -- political leaders, business leaders, officials of regulatory agencies, and environmentalists -- toward the development of nuclear energy in the United States. Some of the highlights of the study are the following:

-- The American public believes strongly that this nation is facing a serious energy shortage today, and that it will not disappear overnight. Four steps to ease the crisis receive majority public support: speeding up the construction of the Alaskan oil pipeline, off-shore drilling for oil, increasing efforts to produce oil shale in the Western states, and speeding up the building of new nuclear power plants. By a smaller margin, the public would also favor allowing more strip mining of coal. The public is not willing, however, to sacrifice the environment to the energy cause; by 65 to 26% Americans oppose slowing down the clean-up of air and water pollution as a step to help solve the energy shortage.

-- The American people recognize that they are using increasingly more electricity. Furthermore, they feel that the price of electricity is rising faster than the prices of most things and that the shortage of electricity in this country will be greater ten years from now than it is today.

PUBLIC WANTS ENERGY INDEPENDENCE

-- Four in five Americans (and majorities of business leaders and regulators) would like the United States to become totally independent of foreign energy sources. Opposition to such independence comes from two leadership groups, however -- political leaders and environmentalists. While the public would like to eliminate this country's dependence on

foreign energy sources, they are not confident that this will come about in the next twenty years.

-- The American public views nuclear energy as a viable alternative to fossil fuels as a source of electric power. Sixty-eight percent of the public feel that the United States has the technical know-how today to build enough nuclear power plants that could meet U.S. electric power needs. Only 39% of the public (and fewer leaders) feel that way about solar energy. Leaders are less optimistic than the public about the speed with which either nuclear or solar plants can be built.

PUBLIC CONCERNS

-- The public identifies some "major" problems connected with nuclear power plants. By far the biggest drawback in the public's mind is the disposal of radioactive waste materials, considered a "major" problem by 63% of the public (and comparable numbers of all leadership groups as well). In addition, other problems include the escape of radioactivity into the atmosphere (49% consider this "major"), followed by the chance of an explosion in the case of an accident (47%), the discharge of warm water into lakes and rivers that could endanger fish and other water life (47%), the threat of sabotage (39%), giving off polluting fumes (36%), and the possibility of theft of plutonium (34%).

SAFETY AS VIEWED BY THE PUBLIC

-- The public clearly recognizes some potential dangers of nuclear power plants. On balance, however, Americans feel nuclear power plants are safe: 26% "very safe" and 38% "somewhat safe". Only 13% of the public feel they are "not so safe", and 5% that they are "dangerous". (Another 18% of the public are undecided.) With the exception of

environmentalists, the leaders surveyed are far more likely to consider nuclear plants safe than the public.

-- Neighbors of nuclear power plants have clearly learned to live with them. If anything, familiarity breeds confidence in the safety of nuclear plants. Thirty-five percent of neighbors of such plants consider them "very safe", compared with 26% of the public at large who feel that way. Residents of San Onofre, California (48% "very safe") appear to trust the safety of their plant more than those in Morris, Illinois (33%) and Indian Point, New York (25%). Faith in the safety of nuclear plants runs higher in the West than in the rest of the country, and highest among the college educated. Men appear to have more confidence in their safety than women, many of whom have not yet made up their minds on the matter.

PUBLIC CITES ADVANTAGES OF NUCLEAR POWER

-- The public identifies some real advantages of nuclear energy over coal and oil. Nuclear energy and coal are felt to enjoy two main advantages over oil: that they make the U.S. less dependent on foreign sources and that they could be obtained almost entirely within the United States. While oil is felt to enjoy one plus over coal or nuclear energy -- it raises fewer health hazards and dangers -- nuclear energy is credited with surpassing coal and oil on some major counts: it will not run out of supply, it is a reliable form of energy in the long run, it can be produced in almost unlimited quantities, it is a cleaner source of energy and a cheaper form of energy. In fact, when the public volunteered the major advantages of nuclear power plants, that nuclear energy is cheaper and that it is cleaner led the list.

-- If proper safeguards and precautions are taken, the American public is prepared to live with the risks involved in building nuclear energy plants. By 63 to 19%, the public favors the building of more nuclear power plants in the United States. Support for more plants is greatest among business leaders (92 to 6%); only environmentalists are opposed (77 to 19%). Furthermore, by 54 to 24%, the public would be in favor of having nuclear power as the main source of energy for electric power in their own community. Support for nuclear power in their own community runs even higher (61 to 22%) among those who already live near nuclear plants. Living with nuclear power has left neighbors more convinced than the public at large that nuclear energy is a cheaper and cleaner source of energy.

LEADERS MISREAD PUBLIC CONCERN OVER ENVIRONMENT

-- Leadership groups misjudged the opinion of the American Public in a number of key areas. Leaders surveyed -- and particularly political leaders -- seriously underestimated public concern over the preservation of the environment. Leaders also underestimated public support for the building of more nuclear power plants in the United States. The public does not voice the concern over the safety of nuclear power that their leaders predicted they would.

-- For the final word on nuclear energy, the public and leaders alike look with greater confidence to scientists than they do to any other group (e.g., government leaders, the media, environmentalists). Among the media, television network news and the news magazines enjoy the greatest public credibility in reporting the facts on nuclear power development. The public does not admit to being easily swayed in its opinions on nuclear energy. It is clear, however, that the most effective spokesmen

in favor of nuclear energy are the federal successors of the Atomic Energy Commission and, to a lesser extent, President Ford. The most effective opponents are environmental groups and Ralph Nader.

-- Twenty-three percent of the public express "a great deal" of confidence in the people running the electric power companies. With confidence in all major institutions at a record low these days, the electric power companies are surpassed only by higher education (36%) and television news (34%) as institutions which command public confidence. Opponents of nuclear energy -- Ralph Nader and environmentalists -- command no more or less confidence than electric power companies. The public credits local power companies with providing good service and adequate supplies of electricity. Electric power companies are not credited, however, with much concern for the consumer's pocketbook.

-- The public looks to government for the regulation of nuclear energy development, and would support tax-free bonds sold by electric power companies to finance it. Nonetheless, there remains deep distrust among the American public of government control of private industry, and the public chooses to leave the ownership and operation of nuclear power plants in the hands of the private sector.

METHODOLOGY

Between March 21st and April 3rd, 1975, in-person door-to-door interviews were conducted with a cross section of 1,537 scientifically selected households nationwide. The public sample is projectable to the entire continental United States population 18 years of age and over.

In addition to the public, 301 interviews were conducted with neighbors of three nuclear power plants: 105 in San Onofre, California; 93 in Morris, Illinois; and 103 in Indian Point, New York. As with the public sample, the sample of neighbors of nuclear power plants was selected by random probability sampling techniques and represents a cross section of people who live in those areas. Again, all interviews were conducted in person and in the homes of respondents. The special sample of neighbors of nuclear power plants was included in the study to determine the extent to which people who live near site locations are different from the public at large in their attitudes toward nuclear power.

Finally, between March 31st and April 12th, 1975, specially trained Harris executive interviewers conducted in-person interviews with 201 leaders nationwide: 51 political leaders (elected and appointed federal, local and state officials), 51 business leaders (vice presidents of public affairs in large and medium-sized companies), 47 regulators (officials of federal and state regulatory agencies such as the Energy Research and Development Administration, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the Environmental Protection Agency, state regulatory commissions) and 52 environmental leaders (Sierra Club, leading environmental groups). A more knowledgeable and articulate group than the public at large, the leadership group was included because they are more likely to become involved in the detailed discussion and resolution of the problems involved in nuclear energy development.

Interviews with the public and neighbors of nuclear power sites averaged 1 hour and 18 minutes in length. Interviews with leaders averaged 1 hour in length. The following pages of this report present an in-depth analysis of the attitudes expressed by both the public and leaders during those interviews.

The terms under which this study was undertaken must be understood. The design of the study and the substance and wording of the questions was fully under the professional control of the Harris firm from beginning to end.

This study was conducted under the personal supervision of Louis Harris, President, and Carolyn Setlow, Senior Vice President, of Louis Harris and Associates.

SECTION I:

ENERGY SHORTAGES: TODAY AND TOMORROW

The American public believes strongly that this nation is

Table 1 facing a serious energy shortage. While there has been a six-point decrease in the perceived seriousness of the shortage, since January, nonetheless 78% of the public consider the energy shortage to be serious (38% "very serious", 40% "somewhat serious").

Leadership groups are far more alarmed about the energy shortage than is the public, however. Compared with 38% of the public,

Table 2 78% of political leaders, 76% of business leaders, 72% of regulators and 56% of environmentalists consider 1975's shortage "very serious." While none of the groups surveyed expect the shortage to subside over the next five years, both the public and leaders anticipate that the energy shortage will be somewhat less serious ten years from now than it is today: 38% of the public call it "very serious" today, compared with 33% who expect it to be that way ten years from now. Leaders expect the let-up in the shortage to be even more dramatic: 78% of political leaders, for example, call it "very serious" today, compared with 51% who expect it to be that way in a decade.

Strongly convinced themselves that this nation is suffering

Table 3 a serious energy shortage, leaders nonetheless underestimate the public's concern. Only 10% of political leaders, for example, estimate that the public considers the shortage is very serious today, while 38% of the public in fact feel that way. Similarly, only 8% of political leaders estimate that the public expects a long-term shortage, compared with 33% of the public who feel it will be very serious ten years from now.

Observation:

That the public and leaders do not feel the energy shortage will disappear overnight suggests that there may be a willingness on the part of the public and leaders to make a long-term commitment to finding solutions to the problem. Leadership consistently under-estimates public concern over the energy shortage.

Table 4 Aware of a general energy shortage, the public does not feel, however, that there is a shortage of electric power. Only 12% of the public feel that it exists. Such a shortage is felt more in the East than in other parts of the country, but even there only 19% feel that such a shortage exists. Even among business leaders, who are more likely than other groups to believe that there is an electricity shortage, only one in five feel that there is such a shortage.

Table 5 However, substantial numbers of those surveyed -- the public, residents of nuclear power sites and leaders -- expect the shortage of electric power to increase over the next decade. Three in ten Americans, and nearly half of all business leaders, anticipate a shortage of electric power where they live ten years from now. A higher four in ten people expect a shortage of electric power in the country ten years from now, and majorities of all leaders (except environmentalists) agree.

Table 6 Once again, leaders attribute to the American people greater complacency than exists. Only 18% of political and business leaders, for example, feel that the public expects a shortage of electric power in the future, compared with a higher 39% of the public who indeed feel that way.

Table 7,8,9 Although few Americans feel there is an electricity shortage, 41% say that they are using more electricity today than they did five years ago. Furthermore, 65% of the public (and a full 79% of Easterners) feel that the price of electric power has gone up more than the price of most other things they buy.

Observation:

While the public acknowledges a serious energy shortage, they do not feel that such a shortage yet poses a threat to the availability of electric power. They recognize, however, that they are using more electricity than they used to, that the price of electricity is rising even faster than the prices of most things, and that the shortage of electricity in this country will be greater ten years from now than it is today. Once again, however, leaders underestimate the public's concern.

Table 10 The public also anticipates some change over the next decade in the main sources of energy used to produce electric power. While 27% identify oil as their local electric power company's main source of energy, only 7% expect that to be the case ten years from now. In the public's view, the next ten years will see a decline in the use of oil, coal and hydro-electric power, and an increase in the use of nuclear power and solar energy to produce electric power.

Table 11 Residents of nuclear plant areas anticipate an even greater increase in the use of nuclear power over the next decade. With the exception of environmentalists (who expect only a slight increase in the development of nuclear power), all leadership groups surveyed expect nuclear power to be used much more in the future than it is today. Leaders are much less likely than the public, however, to anticipate an increase in the use of solar energy for the production of electric power.

The public at large anticipates a decrease in the use of coal to produce electricity. Leaders however -- and particularly environmentalists -- expect an increase. In fact, environmentalists expect a far more dramatic increase in the use of coal than of any other energy source. Environmentalists expect a sharper rise in the use of coal than other leaders, and a far more drastic decline in the use of oil.

Tables
12,13,14,15

There is no doubt that the public sees nuclear energy as a viable alternative to fossil fuels. In fact, 68% of the public feel that the United States now has "the technical know-how to build enough nuclear plants to meet our electric power needs." In contrast, only 39% of the public (and far lower proportions of leaders) feel that this country now has the technical know-how to build enough solar energy plants.

The public is more optimistic than leaders about the time it would take for the U.S. to build enough nuclear or solar plants to meet our electric power needs. To build enough nuclear plants, the public estimates that a median 12 years are necessary, while leaders estimate nearly twice that long. To build enough solar energy plants, the public estimates a median of 15 years are necessary; leaders expect it to take over 25 years.

Observation:

The American public and its leaders (except environmentalists) predict a trend away from the use of oil to produce electricity and in the direction of nuclear energy. Nuclear energy is judged by the public and leaders alike as much closer at hand than solar energy. Environmentalists feel even more strongly than either the public or other leaders that the use of oil will diminish, but they feel that it will be replaced not by nuclear energy but by coal. Findings throughout this report will determine whether these responses reflect objective expectations alone, or subjective preferences for energy developments as well.

Table 16

Predictions for future sources of energy reflect expectations for the kinds of fuel shortages this country is likely to suffer ten years from now.

Among all groups surveyed, larger proportions expect oil shortages ten years from now than feel that such shortages exist today. While 39% of the public feel there are oil shortages today, for example, 48% anticipate them in a decade. While 51% of political leaders feel there are shortages today, a higher 82% expect them ten years from now.

In addition to growing oil shortages, the public expects shortages of coal to increase over the next ten years as well. Leaders do not agree with the public here. If anything, leadership groups expect coal shortages to be less prevalent in a decade than they are today.

Leaders are far more likely than the public to anticipate shortages of both solar energy and nuclear power ten years from now. Nevertheless, as with the public, leaders feel that shortages of both solar and nuclear energy will be less prevalent a decade from now than they are today.

Observation:

Leaders are clearly less optimistic than the public about the speed of development of nuclear and solar energy over the next decade. Nevertheless, both groups (the public and leaders) seem to agree that the diminished supply of oil will have to be made up for by increased availability of other energy sources, including coal, solar energy, and nuclear power. There is no question in leaders' minds that coal will be more accessible than either solar or nuclear energy. In fact, contrary to public opinion, leaders expect coal to become more plentiful over the next decade.

Tables
17,18

The survey tested eight specific steps that might be taken to help solve the energy crisis. Among the eight steps tested, four receive majority public support:

-- By 81 to 10%, the public would speed up construction of the Alaska oil pipeline. Support for this step drops to 73% in the West, an overwhelming majority in favor nonetheless. Strongest backing is found among

business leaders who would approve the speed-up by 94 to 4%. Only environmentalists are opposed (by 46 to 44%).

-- By 67 to 16%, the public would increase efforts to produce oil shale in the Western states. A slimmer majority in the West (56 to 26%) favor such efforts. Among leaders, political leaders show weaker support (59% in favor) than business types or regulators. Environmentalists are strongly opposed to increased oil shale production by 69 to 21%.

-- Two out of three Americans (by 66 to 19%) favor the starting of off-shore drilling for oil off the Atlantic, Pacific and Gulf coasts. Again, support is lower in the West than in any other part of the nation. As with the above two steps, business leaders express the strongest support of the four leadership groups. Environmentalists are evenly divided on this issue.

-- The fourth and last step to receive majority support is speeding up the building of new nuclear power plants. The public favors such a step by 67-18%. Neighbors of nuclear power plants (60 to 25%) do not differ much from the American public at large. Strongest backing again comes from business leaders (90% in favor), followed by regulators (72% in favor). Political leaders are also in favor of speeding up nuclear development, but by a much slimmer 51 to 47% endorsement. Environmentalists expressed strong 79 to 13% opposition.

Three other measures tested receive plurality support from the public: allowing more strip mining of coal (49 to 35% in favor), using U.S. Naval oil reserves for general consumption (43 to 40% in favor) and eliminating electric power plants that use oil by 1980 (42 to 31% in favor). Unlike the public, however, political, business and regulatory agency leaders express majority support for more strip mining. Once again, environmentalists are opposed. Majorities of all leadership groups oppose the elimination of oil-

generated electric power plants. Political leaders stand out as the only group with a majority in favor of using U.S. Naval oil reserves for general consumption.

The public and most leaders are not willing, however, to sacrifice the environment to the energy cause. By 65 to 26%, the public opposes slowing down the clean-up of air and water pollution as a step to help solve the energy crisis. Not surprisingly, environmentalists would be nearly unanimously opposed to such a slowdown. Only business leaders would favor energy solutions at the expense of the environment.

Table 19

The above results represent some shifts in public opinion over the last five months. Support for eliminating oil-generated power plants dropped from 47% to 42% since November 1974. Support for slowing down the clean-up of pollution dwindled from 39% to 26% since November 1974. Support for the speed-up of nuclear power plant construction remained stable over the same time span.

Observation:

The public would be strongly opposed to energy solutions that would jeopardize the cleanliness of the air and water. Only the business community would accept such a trade-off.

This first test of attitudes toward nuclear energy suggests real openness on the part of the public toward the development of this energy source. Contrary to some expectations, Americans who live near nuclear power plants are no less predisposed to speeding up nuclear energy development than the public at large. In their support for nuclear energy development, the public appears to be well ahead of their elected and appointed leaders, who support such a speed-up by a slimmer majority. Environmentalists as a group can be counted on for firm opposition to an acceleration of nuclear development.

Table 20

The public expressed majority support for all three of the eight steps tested above that would help to make the United States oil self-sufficient: speeding up construction of the Alaska oil pipeline, increasing production of oil shale, and off-shore drilling. A desire for total energy independence runs deep through the public: by 80 to 16%, Americans would like to see the United States become totally independent of all foreign sources of energy. The under 30 group are less likely than their elders to favor total independence of all foreign energy sources.

Leadership groups are in disagreement about the desirability of energy self-sufficiency. While majorities of business leaders and energy regulators would like to see the United States become totally independent of all foreign sources of energy, majorities of political leaders and environmentalists would not.

Table 21

Although 80% of the public would like the U.S. to be totally independent of foreign energy sources, they are not confident that this will come about over the next twenty years: 12% feel such independence is "certain to happen" while 33% feel it is "likely to happen." While the public is divided on the likelihood of U.S. energy independence, leaders are not. No more than one in four leaders in each group surveyed feel that this is "certain" or "likely" to happen. Those most opposed to the country's becoming totally independent of all foreign energy sources -- political leaders and environmentalists -- are also those most certain that this won't happen.

Observation:

The results suggest that the public would be receptive to all energy developments that would reduce the nation's dependence on foreign energy sources, even though realistically they do not think energy independence from abroad is feasible. This combined with majority approval for speeding up the building of nuclear plants suggests public support for President Ford's goal of 200 reactors built by 1985.

Opposition to Project Independence comes from two leadership groups, however -- political leaders and environmentalists. In this respect, political leaders do not reflect the thinking of the public at large. The concerns of political leaders and environmentalists on this matter will be explored later in this report.

Table 1
HOW SERIOUS IS THE ENERGY SHORTAGE IN THE U.S. TODAY

	Total Public			
	<u>Very Serious</u> %	<u>Somewhat Serious</u> %	<u>Not Serious at All</u> %	<u>Not Sure</u> %
April 1975	38	40	18	4
January 1975	44	40	12	4
July 1974	26	41	30	3
June 1974	22	44	31	3
April 1974	23	45	28	4
March 1974	22	44	28	6
February 1974	31	41	22	6
January 1974	34	45	17	4
November 1973	50	37	9	4
September 1973	28	45	21	6
April 1973	47	30	16	7

A.1a,b,c

Table 2
SERIOUSNESS OF ENERGY SHORTAGE IN THIS COUNTRY

	<u>Total Public</u> %	<u>Political Leaders</u> %	<u>Business Leaders</u> %	<u>Regulators</u> %	<u>Environmentalists</u> %
<u>Today</u>					
Very serious	38	78	76	72	56
Only somewhat serious	40	20	20	21	31
Hardly serious at all	18	2	4	4	13
Not sure	4	-	-	3	-
<u>Five Years From Now</u>					
Very serious	40	82	71	62	56
Only somewhat serious	26	14	25	30	33
Hardly serious at all	19	-	4	4	6
Not sure	15	4	-	4	5
<u>Ten Years From Now</u>					
Very serious	33	51	39	51	41
Only somewhat serious	20	31	49	34	35
Hardly serious at all	26	10	10	11	14
Not sure	21	8	2	4	10

Q.14a,b,c

Table 3
SERIOUSNESS OF ENERGY SHORTAGE IN THIS COUNTRY
("Very serious" only)

	Total Public %	Estimate of Public Opinion by:			
		Politi- cal Leaders %	Busi- ness Leaders %	Regu- lators %	Environ- mental- ists %
Today	38	10	12	15	29
Five years from now	40	12	18	28	27
Ten years from now	33	8	20	21	25

Q.2a

Table 4
WHETHER THERE IS A SHORTAGE OF ELECTRIC POWER
AROUND HERE WHERE YOU LIVE

	<u>Shortage</u> %	<u>No</u> <u>Shortage</u> %	<u>Not Sure</u> %
<u>Total Public</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>4</u>
East	19	76	5
Midwest	6	91	3
South	12	82	6
West	13	83	4
<u>Total Nucplant Neighbors</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>86</u>	<u>5</u>
<u>Political Leaders</u>	<u>18</u>	<u>82</u>	<u>-</u>
<u>Business Leaders</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>78</u>	<u>-</u>
<u>Regulators</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>89</u>	<u>-</u>
<u>Environmentalists</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>88</u>	<u>4</u>

Q.2c,d

Table 5

WHETHER THERE WILL BE A SHORTAGE OF ELECTRIC POWER TEN YEARS FROM NOW

	<u>Total Public %</u>	<u>Total Nucplant Neighbors %</u>	<u>Political Leaders %</u>	<u>Business Leaders %</u>	<u>Regulators %</u>	<u>Environmentalists %</u>
<u>Around Here Where You Live</u>						
Shortage	31	28	41	49	36	28
No shortage	52	55	53	47	49	64
Not sure	17	17	6	4	15	8
<u>In This Country</u>						
Shortage	39	39	62	63	54	33
No shortage	45	40	30	27	33	53
Not sure	16	21	8	10	13	14

Q.14d

Table 6
WHETHER THERE WILL BE A SHORTAGE OF ELECTRIC POWER
IN THIS COUNTRY TEN YEARS FROM NOW

	Total Public %	Estimate of Public Opinion by:			
		<u>Politi- cal Leaders</u> %	<u>Busi- ness Leaders</u> %	<u>Regu- lators</u> %	<u>Environ- mental- ists</u> %
Shortage	39	18	18	21	29
No shortage	45	72	78	75	55
Not sure	16	10	4	4	16

Q.4b

Table 7
USE OF ELECTRICITY TODAY COMPARED TO FIVE YEARS AGO

	<u>Total Public</u> %	<u>Total Nucplant Neighbors</u> %	<u>Political Leaders</u> %	<u>Business Leaders</u> %	<u>Regulators</u> %	<u>Environmentalists</u> %
Using a lot more	16	15	10	20	17	6
Using some, but not a lot more	25	21	18	32	28	12
Using about the same amount	36	36	39	22	30	29
Using some, but not a lot less	13	16	25	20	19	36
Using a lot less	7	10	6	6	6	13
Not sure	3	2	2	-	-	4

Using more	41	36	28	52	45	18
Using same	36	36	39	22	30	29
Using less	20	26	31	26	25	49

-17-

Q.4d

Table 8
RISE IN PRICES OF SPECIFIC ITEMS, COMPARED TO MOST OTHER THINGS YOU BUY

	<u>Total Public %</u>	<u>Total Nucplant Neighbors %</u>	<u>Political Leaders %</u>	<u>Business Leaders %</u>	<u>Regulators %</u>	<u>Environmentalists %</u>
<u>Gasoline</u>						
Gone up more	76	82	72	67	68	58
Gone up less	3	3	4	6	9	4
About as much	19	12	24	27	23	33
Not sure	2	3	-	-	-	5
<u>Medical Services and Drugs</u>						
Gone up more	75	77	75	67	72	65
Gone up less	3	3	4	8	2	4
About as much	17	14	16	24	19	13
Not sure	5	6	5	1	7	18
<u>Electric Power</u>						
Gone up more	65	65	65	49	53	60
Gone up less	7	6	8	22	15	8
About as much	25	26	27	29	30	25
Not sure	3	3	-	-	2	7
<u>Meat</u>						
Gone up more	44	43	22	14	9	23
Gone up less	12	10	14	16	15	15
About as much	42	43	63	70	70	44
Not sure	2	4	1	-	6	18

-18-

Table 9
RISE IN PRICE OF ELECTRIC POWER, COMPARED TO MOST OTHER THINGS YOU BUY

	<u>Gone Up More Than Most Other Things You Buy</u> %	<u>Gone Up Less</u> %	<u>Gone Up About As Much As Other Things</u> %	<u>Not Sure</u> %
<u>Total Public</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>3</u>
East	79	3	15	3
Midwest	56	9	32	3
South	65	9	25	1
West	60	8	28	4
Cities	70	8	19	3
Suburbs	67	5	25	3
Towns	54	13	33	-
Rural	65	6	27	2
Under \$5,000	65	9	22	4
\$5,000-\$9,999	71	6	22	1
\$10,000-\$14,999	65	5	26	4
\$15,000 and over	60	9	27	4
<u>Total Nucplant Neighbors</u>	<u>65</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>3</u>
Indian Point, N.Y.	82	6	11	1
Morris, Ill.	55	8	37	-
San Onofre, Calif.	58	6	32	4

Q.4e,f

Table 10
LOCAL ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY'S MAIN SOURCE OF ENERGY
TO PRODUCE ELECTRIC POWER

	Public			Nucplant Neighbors		
	Today	Ten Years	Net	Today	Ten Years	Net
	%	From Now	Change	%	From Now	Change
Oil	27	7	-20	32	8	-24
Coal	20	12	-8	16	7	-9
Hydro-electric power	14	9	-5	5	4	-1
Nuclear power	4	30	+26	15	45	+30
Solar energy	1	11	+10	-	9	+9
Other	1	1	-	-	*	-
Not sure	36	34	-2	36	30	-6

Q.4e,f

Table 11

NET CHANGE PREDICTED IN LOCAL ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY'S MAIN SOURCE OF ENERGY
TO PRODUCE ELECTRIC POWER OVER NEXT TEN YEARS

	<u>Total Public</u> %	<u>Total Nucplant Neighbors</u> %	<u>Political Leaders</u> %	<u>Business Leaders</u> %	<u>Regulators</u> %	<u>Environmentalists</u> %
Nuclear power	+26	+30	+33	+39	+26	+4
Solar energy	+10	+9	+4	-	+4	-
Hydro-electric power	-5	-1	-2	-4	-15	+2
Coal	-8	-9	+8	+2	+6	+34
Oil	-20	-24	-23	-23	-17	-35
Other	-	-	-8	-6	-4	-
Not sure	-2	-6	-2	-4	-4	-9

Q.7g

Table 12
WHETHER U.S. NOW HAS TECHNICAL KNOW-HOW TO BUILD ENOUGH NUCLEAR PLANTS
TO MEET OUR ELECTRIC POWER NEEDS

	Has Technical <u>Know-how Now</u> %	Technology Not Yet <u>Developed</u> %	Not Sure %
Total Public	68	20	12
Total Nucplant Neighbors	75	17	8
Political Leaders	67	29	4
Business Leaders	86	10	4
Regulators	68	30	2
Environmentalists	39	57	4

Table 13
 HOW LONG IT WOULD TAKE FOR U.S. TO BUILD ENOUGH NUCLEAR PLANTS
 TO MEET A MAJOR PART OF OUR ELECTRIC POWER NEEDS

	Under 5 Years %	5-9 Years %	10-14 Years %	15-25 Years %	Over 25 Years %	Not Sure %	Median Number Of Years #
Total Public	8	18	26	17	6	25	12
Total Nucplant Neighbors	7	17	23	22	10	21	13
Political Leaders	2	6	16	38	34	4	21
Business Leaders	-	8	25	36	29	2	19
Regulators	-	2	11	42	30	15	22
Environmentalists	-	2	8	38	33	19	23

Table 14
WHETHER U.S. NOW HAS TECHNICAL KNOW-HOW TO BUILD ENOUGH SOLAR ENERGY PLANTS
TO MEET OUR ELECTRIC POWER NEEDS

	<u>Has Technical Know-how Now</u> %	<u>Technology Not Yet Developed</u> %	<u>Not Sure</u> %
Total Public	39	41	20
Total Nucplant Neighbors	40	41	19
Political Leaders	10	86	4
Business Leaders	8	88	4
Regulators	11	87	2
Environmentalists	17	81	2

Q.7j

Table 15
HOW LONG IT WOULD TAKE FOR U.S. TO BUILD ENOUGH SOLAR ENERGY PLANTS
TO MEET A MAJOR PART OF OUR ELECTRIC POWER NEEDS

	Under 5 Years %	5-9 Years %	10-14 Years %	15-25 Years %	Over 25 Years %	Not Sure %	Median Number Of Years #
Total Public	5	12	15	18	16	34	15
Total Nucplant Neighbors	3	9	18	20	16	34	16
Political Leaders	2	2	6	21	63	6	Over 25
Business Leaders	2	6	6	14	58	14	Over 25
Regulators	2	4	9	13	59	13	Over 25
Environmentalists	-	2	8	27	49	14	Over 25

Q.3a,b

Table 16
SHORTAGES OF ENERGY NEEDED TO MAKE ELECTRIC POWER:
TODAY VS. TEN YEARS FROM NOW

	<u>Total Public</u> %	<u>Total Nucplant Neighbors</u> %	<u>Political Leaders</u> %	<u>Business Leaders</u> %	<u>Regulators</u> %	<u>Environmentalists</u> %
<u>Oil</u>						
Shortage today	39	38	51	45	62	44
Shortage ten years from now	48	48	82	75	83	71
Net change	+9	+10	+31	+30	+21	+27
<u>Solar Energy</u>						
Shortage today	31	38	63	72	55	74
Shortage ten years from now	16	15	50	51	62	63
Net change	-15	-23	-13	-21	+7	-11
<u>Nuclear Power</u>						
Shortage today	27	26	46	75	67	33
Shortage ten years from now	13	12	34	41	55	29
Net change	-14	-14	-12	-34	-12	-4
<u>Coal</u>						
Shortage today	23	18	22	25	21	12
Shortage ten years from now	32	28	22	20	11	6
Net change	+9	+10	-	-5	-10	-6

-26-

Q.5a

Table 17
FAVOR/OPOSE STEPS TO HELP SOLVE THE ENERGY CRISIS

	Total Public %	Total Nucplant Neighbors %	Political Leaders %	Business Leaders %	Regulators %	Environ- mentalists %
<u>Speed up construction of the Alaska oil pipeline</u>						
Favor	81	87	76	94	87	44
Oppose	10	8	20	4	11	46
Not sure	9	5	4	2	2	10
<u>Increase efforts to produce oil shale in the Western states</u>						
Favor	67	70	99	80	70	21
Oppose	16	13	37	20	26	69
Not sure	17	17	4	-	4	10
<u>Speed up the building of new nuclear power plants</u>						
Favor	67	60	51	90	72	13
Oppose	18	25	47	8	26	79
Not sure	15	15	2	2	2	8
<u>Start off-shore drilling for oil off the Atlantic, Pacific and Gulf coasts</u>						
Favor	66	59	75	90	70	44
Oppose	19	28	20	6	23	44
Not sure	15	13	5	4	7	12
<u>Allow more strip mining of coal</u>						
Favor	49	47	70	78	62	31
Oppose	35	36	28	22	32	65
Not sure	16	17	2	-	6	4
<u>Use U.S. Naval oil reserves for general consumption</u>						
Favor	43	38	58	37	28	38
Oppose	40	47	34	53	64	50
Not sure	17	15	8	10	8	12
<u>Eliminate electric power plants that use oil by 1980</u>						
Favor	42	32	43	37	40	15
Oppose	31	35	57	61	51	79
Not sure	27	33	-	2	9	6
<u>Slow down the clean-up of air and water pollution</u>						
Favor	26	24	25	67	15	6
Oppose	65	69	73	29	83	94
Not sure	9	7	2	4	2	-

5a(1)

Table 18
FAVOR/OPOSE STEPS TO HELP SOLVE THE ENERGY CRISIS

	Total Public %	East %	Mid- west %	South %	West %	Some High School or Less %	High School Grad./ Some College %	College Grad. %
<u>Speed up construction of the Alaska oil pipeline</u>								
Favor	81	83	83	82	73	80	83	74
Oppose	10	10	8	7	16	5	10	19
Not sure	9	7	9	11	11	15	7	7
<u>Increase efforts to produce oil shale in the Western states</u>								
Favor	67	69	73	67	56	66	69	61
Oppose	16	17	17	9	26	10	18	26
Not sure	17	14	10	24	18	24	13	13
<u>Speed up the building of new nuclear power plants</u>								
Favor	67	65	66	70	64	65	69	63
Oppose	18	21	17	11	22	12	19	25
Not sure	15	14	17	19	14	23	12	12
<u>Start off-shore drilling for oil off the Atlantic, Pacific and Gulf coasts</u>								
Favor	66	66	68	72	51	66	67	60
Oppose	19	19	18	11	34	11	22	30
Not sure	5	15	14	17	15	23	11	10
<u>Allow more strip mining of coal</u>								
Favor	49	45	56	52	41	56	48	36
Oppose	35	40	33	27	43	22	39	51
Not sure	15	15	11	21	16	22	13	13
<u>Use U.S. Naval oil reserves for general consumption</u>								
Favor	43	52	42	39	35	45	40	44
Oppose	40	33	42	39	50	30	46	44
Not sure	17	15	16	22	15	25	14	12
<u>Eliminate electric power plants that use oil by 1980</u>								
Favor	42	48	42	35	41	39	43	43
Oppose	31	25	36	30	34	23	35	39
Not sure	27	27	22	35	25	38	22	18
<u>Slow down the clean-up of air and water pollution</u>								
Favor	26	26	26	31	19	32	24	20
Oppose	65	65	67	59	73	53	71	76
Not sure	9	9	7	10	8	15	5	4

Table 19
FAVOR/OPOSE STEPS TO HELP SOLVE THE ENERGY CRISIS

	<u>April 1975</u>		<u>Nov. 1974</u>		<u>July 1974</u>		<u>Sept. 1973</u>	
	<u>Favor</u> %	<u>Oppose</u> %	<u>Favor</u> %	<u>Oppose</u> %	<u>Favor</u> %	<u>Oppose</u> %	<u>Favor</u> %	<u>Oppose</u> %
Speed up construction of the Alaska oil pipeline	81	10	X	X	81	10	76	12
Increase efforts to produce oil shale in the western states	67	16	X	X	X	X	X	X
Speed up the building of new nuclear power plants	67	18	66	16	75	14	64	21
Start off-shore drilling for oil off the Atlantic, Pacific and Gulf coasts	66	19	X	X	67	19	67	22
Allow more strip mining of coal	49	35	X	X	48	31	42	37
Use U.S. Naval oil reserves for general consumption	43	40	44	34	X	X	X	X
Eliminate electric power plants that use oil by 1980	42	31	47	25	X	X	X	X
Slow down the clean-up of air and water pollution	26	65	39	46	X	X	29	51

Q.5b

Table 20
WHETHER WOULD LIKE TO SEE U.S. BECOME
TOTALLY INDEPENDENT OF ALL FOREIGN SOURCES OF ENERGY

	Would Like to See %	Would Not Like to See %	Not Sure %
<u>Total Public</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>4</u>
18-29 years	73	24	3
30-49 years	84	13	3
50 years and over	83	12	5
<u>Total Nucplant Neighbors</u>	<u>85</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>3</u>
<u>Political Leaders</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>-</u>
<u>Business Leaders</u>	<u>69</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>-</u>
<u>Regulators</u>	<u>74</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>-</u>
<u>Environmentalists</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>67</u>	<u>-</u>

Q.5c

Table 21
REALISTICALLY, HOW GOOD ARE THE CHANCES THAT THE U.S. CAN BE
TOTALLY INDEPENDENT OF ALL FOREIGN SOURCES OF ENERGY IN NEXT 20 YEARS

	Certain To Happen %	Likely To Happen %	Not Likely To Happen %	Almost Certain It Won't Happen %	Not Sure %
<u>Total Public</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>33</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>9</u>
18-29 years	9	32	35	18	6
30-49 years	11	32	36	12	9
50 years and over	14	34	29	11	12
Would like to see U.S. totally independent	13	36	32	10	9
Would <u>not</u> like to see U.S. totally independent	4	19	41	29	7
<u>Total Nucplant Neighbors</u>	<u>15</u>	<u>37</u>	<u>32</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>6</u>
<u>Political Leaders</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>49</u>	<u>-</u>
<u>Business Leaders</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>53</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>-</u>
<u>Regulators</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>36</u>	<u>39</u>	<u>-</u>
<u>Environmentalists</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>-</u>

SECTION II:

THE BALANCE SHEET FOR NUCLEAR ENERGY

In sounding the public's and leaders' attitudes toward nuclear energy the survey probed into perceptions of the disadvantages, advantages, and the trade-offs involved in the development of nuclear power.

Disadvantages of Nuclear Energy

Open-end questioning evoked in the words of those surveyed "the two or three main disadvantages of nuclear power plants to produce electric power." Despite majority public support for speeding up the building of nuclear power plants, all but 37% of the public were able to volunteer some main disadvantages of nuclear power plants:

-- 23% say they are "unsafe, dangerous."

-- 20% refer specifically to the "danger of radiation contamination, leaks, cracks in the reactor."

Table 22

-- 14% mention "danger of accidents, explosions, earthquakes."

-- 10% refer to "problems with radioactive waste disposal."

-- 12% express concern about "thermal pollution," while another 9% refer generally to "pollution, damage to the environment."

-- Small numbers of the public refer in one way or another to the cost of nuclear power plants: 7% generalize ("expensive, high cost") and another 7% mention "high initial costs."

In the words of a 42-year-old black laborer in Jersey City, New Jersey:

"It could explode and leave off radiation. It could also take up a lot of property and not look nice. The plant would be ugly."

A 25-year-old clerical worker in New Orleans, Louisiana expressed his concerns:

"The problem is the danger of nuclear accidents. Also they will have to take necessary procedures to prevent water pollution."

A 53-year-old college educated manager in Yucca Valley, California, volunteered two disadvantages:

- 1) "The danger of radioactivity, the escape of radioactive materials. 2) The danger that some of this material could be stolen for production of an explosive for a radical group." (Only 2% of the public volunteered "the danger of sabotage.")

A 39-year-old college educated proprietor in Minneapolis:

"There's no problem in the use of nuclear energy, but the cost is enormous to produce the plants in the first place. It's okay to have a few reserve plants but they reduce employment, since so few people are needed to run them."

In volunteering the disadvantages of nuclear power plants, neighbors of such plants in San Onofre, Indian Point and Morris do not respond much differently from the public at large. They do express slightly more concern than the public over dangers of accidents and thermal pollution, and public anxiety over safety, but the differences are minimal.

The perceived disadvantages of nuclear power plants in the eyes of leaders are noticeably different from those of the public at large:

-- The number one preoccupation of political leaders is the high cost of nuclear power (43%). Closely behind cost considerations are the dangers of radiation (41%) and the problems of radioactive waste disposal (37%). In all three areas, their concerns here far outweigh those of the public:

"There is a potential for disaster, for radiation in the air and water. Transportation of nuclear materials is another problem. Also the danger to people in the plant, and the potential danger to people in the surrounding area."

-- Business leaders mention costs (24%) as a top problem of nuclear development. Equally as important to them, however, are the danger of radiation (25%), the safety element (24%), problems with disposal of radioactive

wastes (22%) and public anxiety over safety (22%).

In the words of the vice president for community affairs of an important Midwest corporation:

"It takes a long time to build them and they are very expensive. It's hard to satisfy the environmentalists, which will limit the growth of nuclear power."

-- Two disadvantages of nuclear plants are foremost in the minds of regulators: problems with radioactive waste disposal (34%) and the danger of radiation (30%). Regulators also express more concern than any other leadership group with thermal pollution (21%).

-- Environmentalists are primarily concerned with the problem of waste disposal: 50% of this group refer specifically to this problem. In addition they are worried about the danger of radiation (37%) and of accidents, explosions or earthquakes (27%). More than any other group, environmentalists mention the danger of sabotage (21%) or plutonium getting into the wrong hands (10%) as a drawback of nuclear power plants. Compared with these major considerations, thermal pollution (12%) falls surprisingly low on the lists of concerns volunteered by environmentalists.

One California environmentalist put it this way:

"Plutonium waste material is too toxic a substance for mankind to use as fuel. There are inadequate safety procedures and systems. This will have a detrimental influence on the structure of society because of the security requirements necessary for the handling of the material. Eventually, you'll have a police state to protect reactors."

Problems of Waste Disposal

Tables
23,24

In unaided, open-end questioning, only 10% of the public volunteered waste disposal as a main disadvantage of nuclear energy. In direct probing, however, waste disposal emerges as one of the public's primary concerns connected with nuclear power. A 63% majority of the American public (and 66% of neighbors of nuclear plants) identify as a major problem "the disposal of radioactive waste materials which remain radioactive for many centuries to come." The young (72%) and the college educated (72%) are particularly concerned with waste disposal problems.

The only group less wary than the public about waste disposal problems are business leaders. Yet, even among them, 57% see this as a "major" problem. Regulators (76%), political leaders (82%) and, most of all, environmentalists (98%) surpass the public in seeing waste disposal as a major drawback of nuclear power plants.

Table 25

In respect to waste disposal, leadership groups have a very accurate appraisal of public concern.

Table 26

That the public sees waste disposal as a major problem was documented by other findings. Twenty-five percent of the public consider "completely true" and 29% "partly true" the following: "Waste from nuclear power plants can cause radioactivity exposure to too many people." In contrast, however, 67% of environmentalists felt this was "completely true."

Observation:

The public views the problem of disposal of radioactive waste materials as a major problem of nuclear energy. In fact, on direct questioning, the public identifies radioactive waste disposal as the biggest problem connected with nuclear plants.

Escape of Radioactivity

Table 23

In open-end questioning, 23% of the public volunteered its concern over the safety problems of nuclear power and 20% mentioned more specifically the dangers of radiation contamination, leaks and cracks in the reactor. In direct questioning, however, nearly half the public (49%) identify "the escape of radioactivity into the atmosphere" as a "major" problem. People in the East (57%), in cities (55%) and the 18 to 29 year olds (61%) are more likely to see this as a major problem than are other members of the public.

On the whole, leaders are not as concerned as the public about the escape of radioactivity into the atmosphere, with business leaders least concerned of all (only 22% see it as a "major" problem). The exception here is environmentalists, 62% of whom see radioactive leakage as a "major" problem.

Table 26

Fear of radioactive fallout was tested further: 36% of the public find "completely true" and 27% "partly true" the following: "A major radiation leakage from a nuclear power plant can cause fallout that can kill large numbers of people." While residents of nuclear plant neighborhoods are no more likely than the public at large to see the escape of radioactivity as a major problem, they are somewhat more inclined than the public to agree that such leakage, were it to occur, could be fatal to large numbers of people.

Observation:

Half of all Americans identified the escape of radioactivity into the atmosphere as a major problem connected with nuclear power plants. Neighbors of such plants have apparently given more thought to the consequences of such leakage than the public at large. The concern of the public is far surpassed, however, by the preoccupation of environmentalists over the potential threat of radioactive leakage.

Danger of Explosion or Accident

Table 23 Although only 14% of the public volunteered their concern over accidents or explosions in nuclear plants, further probing revealed that public fear runs deeper than that. Forty-seven percent of the public consider "the chance of an explosion in the case of an accident" to be a "major" problem.

Table 26 Similarly, two out of five people find some truth (17% "completely true," 22% "partly true" in the following statement: "A nuclear power plant can fail and the nuclear materials can come together to cause a massive nuclear explosion."

With the exception of environmentalists, who are more concerned than the public about dangers of explosion in nuclear power plants, leaders are not worried about nuclear accidents: no more than one in five members of any leadership group see the threat of explosion as a major problem connected with nuclear plants and only minorities find much truth in the statement about massive nuclear explosions.

Observation:

The public equates the seriousness of the threat of an explosion in the case of an accident with that of the escape of radioactivity into the atmosphere. Both are less cause for public concern than the problem of waste disposal, but are labeled as "major" problems by half the public, and "minor" problems by additional numbers. In both cases, the public's concern is greater than that of political leaders, business leaders and regulators but by no means as great as the worry of environmentalists.

Thermal Pollution

Tables
23,24

Volunteered by only 12% of the public, "the discharge of warm water into lakes and rivers that could endanger fish and other water life" is nonetheless considered a "major" problem by 47% of the public. Interestingly, people in cities and suburbs are as equally concerned as those in towns and rural areas. Leaders as a whole share the public's concern over thermal pollution, with the exception of business leaders; only 22% of them consider this a major problem.

The the public recognizes the threat of thermal pollution is substantiated by further findings: 33% find "completely true" and another 33% "partly true" the following: "Hot water from nuclear power plants endangers fish and other water life in nearby lakes and streams."

Table 25

Thermal pollution emerges as a deeper concern of environmentalists than volunteered responses suggested: 58% consider the danger to marine life to be a "major" problem of nuclear power plants. Both environmentalists and political leaders underestimate public concern here. Only 17% of environmentalists expect the public to see this as a major problem, compared with the 47% of the public who in fact do.

Observation:

Environmentalists give less credit than they deserve to their own efforts of warning the public of the threats of thermal pollution. Two-thirds of the public attribute some truth to the claim that hot water from nuclear plants endangers water life.

Air Pollution

Tables
23,24

Air pollution -- that is, "giving off fumes that can pollute the air -- represents to 36% of the public a "major problem" connected with nuclear power plants. People in the East, in cities and the 18 to 29 year

olds are more concerned about the polluting effect of nuclear energy, as indeed they are about pollution in general, than the rest of the public.

Public concern over the polluting effects of nuclear plants surpasses that of leaders surveyed. Moreover, political leaders and environmentalists grossly underestimate public preoccupation with environmental threats.

Observation:

The public has clearly not communicated to political leaders the extent of their environmental concerns. The public sees in nuclear power plants greater threats of air pollution than do environmentalists. The latter are far more worried about the problems of waste disposal, and of the dangers of radioactive leakage and thermal pollution.

Sabotage or Plutonium Theft

In response to open-end questioning, only the environmentalists expressed any real concern over the danger of sabotage or theft of plutonium. While such threats remain an overwhelming concern of environmentalists, "the threat of attempts to sabotage nuclear power plants" is seen as a "major" problem by 39% of the public. Similarly, "the possibility that plutonium, which is made in a nuclear power plant, could be stolen by radical revolutionaries" is viewed as a "major" problem by 34% of the public.

Table 23

A 55% majority of the public find some truth (only 21% "complete truth") in the claim that "if nuclear power were being produced all over the country, some revolutionaries or criminals could steal nuclear materials and make their own atom bombs."

Table 26

Political leaders share the public's concern over potential sabotage or plutonium theft, while businessmen reduce such threats to "minor" problems at most.

Safety of Nuclear Power Plants

The public clearly recognizes some potential dangers in nuclear power plants, among them the problems of waste disposal, escape of radioactivity, danger of explosions or accidents, and thermal pollution.

Table 27

On balance, however, Americans feel nuclear power plants are safe: 26% "very safe" and 38% "somewhat safe." Only 13% of the public feel they are "not so safe", and only 5% go so far as to volunteer that they are "dangerous". (Another 18% of the public are "not sure".)

Neighbors of nuclear power plants have more confidence in the safety of such plants than the public at large -- 35% of residents of plant areas consider them "very safe", compared with 26% of the public at large who feel that way. Neighbors of the San Onofre plant (48% "very safe") appear to trust the safety of the plant more than those in Morris (33%) or Indian Point (25%).

Faith in the safety of nuclear plants runs higher in the West than in the rest of the country. The college educated (35% "very safe") are less concerned about safety problems than the less well educated. Finally, men (38%) appear to have more confidence in their safety than women (15% "very safe"), many of whom have not yet made up their mind on the matter.

Observation:

Neighbors of nuclear power plants have clearly learned to live with them. If anything, familiarity breeds confidence in the safety of such plants. The results here may reflect two possibilities: 1) that the smooth operations of nearby plants have relieved residents of any safety concerns they may have had, or 2) that knowing the plants are there to stay, neighbors have successfully rationalized away their fears.

Table 28

With the exception of environmentalists, the leadership groups are far more likely to consider nuclear plants safe than is the public: 67% of business leaders, 50% of political leaders and 49% of regulatory agency officials go so far as to call them "very safe." This figure drops dramatically to 10% among environmentalists, however.

Table 29

Most leaders tend to exaggerate, however, the public's alarm over the dangers of nuclear plants. Only 18% of the public judge plants as "not so safe" or "dangerous"; a higher 38% of political leaders, for example, expect the public to feel that way.

Members of the public and leaders who judged nuclear power plants as unsafe explain why they feel that way:

In the words of a 34-year-old professional in Madison, Wisconsin:

"Due to large amounts of complex piping, the possibility of leakage is always present. Even with monitoring and detection systems, any leakage in a nuclear power plant will require a shutdown of the power system until repairs can be made. The transportation of waste materials provides a greater possibility of contamination of our environment."

A 51-year-old sales clerk in Brooklyn, New York:

"There is always the chance of an explosion and destruction that could wipe out the whole community. People could get sick from the radioactivity that could escape from the nuclear power plants."

A 47-year-old black farmer in Council, North Carolina explains his hesitations over the safety of nuclear plants:

"One caught fire the other night and even burned up the safety thing that was supposed to work. I don't want that powerful stuff around me. They might think they have it under control when they don't."

A New York State regulator explains his reasons for judging nuclear plants unsafe:

"We're dealing with a complex system we don't understand. What takes two welders to fix in an oil plant shuts down a nuclear plant because of radioactivity and other dangers. If you have a requirement for a small amount of power for a short time and money is no object, you can run nuclear power plants. But for routine and continuous operations it requires a level of reliability so high we can't do it at a cost which will make operations possible."

The vice president for corporate planning of a major conglomerate:

"The technology to prevent accidents is inadequate today. It will be such a long time, more than 25 years, before we can be sure of adequate protective systems. Much more research must be directed toward safety measures as well as progress in production."

The director of a Midwestern environmental institute points out:

"There are the Atomic Energy Commission's reports of leakage and of missing contaminants, reports of faulty plant construction, failures in safety back-up systems -- all confirmed by independent studies which have resulted in the current ban on all further atomic plant construction."

Members of the public who consider plants unsafe refer primarily

Table 30

to the need for more research and not knowing all the consequences (11%), the danger of radiation, leakage (10%) and the danger of explosions, accidents, breakdowns (8%). Neighbors of nuclear power plants are more likely to mention danger of explosions, accidents or breakdowns (12%) than any other reason for finding them unsafe.

The public and leaders who consider the plants safe base their judgment primarily on the past record of nuclear plants. In addition there is the feeling, particularly among business leaders, regulators and political leaders, that there are many precautions taken to keep them safe.

According to a 27-year-old professional in Gardenia, California:

"I live close to one which has been running some years and there has been no problem. I haven't heard of any problems in the news about other plants."

A 40-year-old manager in Albany, New York:

"They have been operating for years without any accidents, no deaths, no injuries. Insurance companies have been refunding premiums. There are over 70 nuclear plants in the world with no serious incidents due to nuclear accidents."

A 37-year-old farmer in Wilber, Nebraska feels that government regulations can assure their safety:

"I think they would be safe if the personnel followed safety regulations, if the workers were conscientious and did their work right. A lot depends on the regulations that the government would put on these power plants."

In the words of the director of a state energy office in the East:

"I guess basically I feel they are very safe because I understand the technology they are using and I understand the precautions that are being followed. The radiation protection, construction and emergency shutdown procedures are very safe and sound."

According to an executive of a major West coast corporation:

"There has never been a major accident. We have 4,000 reactors, both military and commercial, that have yet to injure the public. Accidents have been minor and have not involved the public, only a very few employees of a plant. The amount of waste produced is very slight. Thermal pollution will not be a problem unless we become more overpopulated than we are now, and we can control that."

A nuclear technology specialist in a Western state's atomic energy commission:

"Just look at the safety record of the nuclear power plants already built since 1957. No member of the general public has ever been killed in one. There is strict enforcement of the safety rules of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission."

Observation:

Despite much talk on the part of environmentalists about the dangers of nuclear power, the public is not convinced. Their judgment is based primarily on the past record of such power plants, and a basic confidence that necessary precautions and safeguards will be taken. Apart from environmentalists, who point primarily to problems of waste disposal, inadequate technical capabilities, dangers of explosion and leakage, leaders have even more confidence in the safety of nuclear plants than the public.

Advantages of Nuclear Energy

Just as the study probed into people's notions of the drawbacks of nuclear energy, so it generated open-end responses to the "two or three main advantages of nuclear power plants."

Table 31

Top of the public's list here are the belief that nuclear power is "cheap, less expensive to use" (31%), "clean energy, less pollution" (25%), "unlimited supply, abundant source, reusable" (21%), "more powerful, efficient, high output of energy" (12%) and "makes U.S. independent of foreign oil" (11%).

In the words of an 18-year-old skilled craftsman in Los Angeles, California:

"Nuclear plants mean more power for homes and buildings. It gives people jobs and won't pollute as much as oil and coal."

According to a 37-year-old sales worker in Yucca Valley, California:

"Nuclear plants will produce more power for the U.S.A. without depending on foreign countries. It could be produced more economically. Our rates wouldn't have to be so high."

A 24-year-old manager in Greenville, Mississippi, points to four advantages:

"1) It can be made quicker than oil can be refined, 2) it will be cheaper, 3) there's no pollution output from it, and 4) there's no shortage of nuclear power."

Neighbors of nuclear power plants are more likely than the public at large to refer to the lower costs of nuclear energy and to its cleanliness as an energy source.

With the exception of environmentalists (35% of whom saw no advantages), leaders volunteered each of the above advantages in greater numbers than did the public. Unlike business leaders and regulators, who attach equal importance to the inexpensiveness and cleanliness of nuclear energy, political leaders are more impressed with its low pollution rate than with its cheap cost.

Cheaper Source of Energy

Although only 31% of the public volunteered its low cost as a main advantage of nuclear plants, there is evidence that the public at large sees nuclear energy as a means to cheaper electricity. When asked directly about the price advantage, 79% say "having nuclear power plants which produce cheaper electric power" is a "major" advantage of nuclear power. In addition, 75% consider "once constructed, nuclear power plants producing less expensive electricity" as a "major" advantage.

Table 32

Compared with oil and coal, the public sees nuclear energy as an energy source that will become increasingly inexpensive over time. Fifty-three percent of the public feel that nuclear energy "will be a cheaper form of energy in the future than it is now"; only 18% of the public feel that way about oil and 28% about coal. Business leaders (61%) are even more convinced than the public that nuclear energy will become cheaper in the future. Only minorities of political leaders (39%), regulators (32%) and environmentalists (25%) share this view, however.

Table 34

Polluting Effects of Nuclear Energy

Sixty-three percent of the public consider a "major" advantage "nuclear power plants creating no pollution of the air and water, such as that created by electric power plants using oil or coal." Only environmentalists have some reservations here; 40% of them see the non-polluting effects of nuclear plants as a "major" advantage.

ble 32

In all, 62% of the public find truth (35% "completely true", 27% "partly true") in the claim that "nuclear power actually pollutes far less than electric power produced from oil or coal." Majorities of all leadership groups but environmentalists consider this statement "completely true". One in four environmentalists go so far as to dismiss this statement as "completely untrue."

Table 33

In evaluating nuclear plants as polluters, a distinction needs to be made on its effect on the air and on water.

The public and leaders alike are more convinced of nuclear energy's non-polluting effect on the air than they are of the same effect on water. Fifty-seven percent of the public think it is "a clean source of energy and doesn't pollute the air so much," compared with 44% who say it "doesn't pollute the water so much." In both cases, however, the public credits nuclear energy far more than oil or coal with having a non-polluting effect.

In terms of air pollution, leaders are far more positive about nuclear energy than they are about oil or coal. The exception here is environmentalists, who see nuclear energy as no better than oil in this respect but somewhat better than coal. In terms of water pollution, leaders see nuclear energy and oil as about equally responsible. Only environmentalists opt two-to-one for oil over nuclear energy as a non-pollutant of the water.

Observation:

Concerns over thermal pollution and its effect on marine life are clearly on people's minds as they judge nuclear energy as a water pollutant. Nevertheless, the public at large, political leaders, business leaders and regulators see nuclear energy as less a threat to clean water than oil or coal. As a preserver of clean air, nuclear energy is placed head and shoulders above oil and coal by all but the environmentalists.

Unlimited Source of Energy

Only one in five Americans volunteered its unlimited supply as a major advantage of nuclear energy. When questioned directly, however, 74% of the public consider a "major" advantage "eventually, nuclear power plants using the same energy over and over again, eliminating any future shortage of energy to produce electric power." Apart from environmentalists, majorities of all leaders agree that this is a major advantage of nuclear energy.

In this respect the public gives nuclear power higher marks than it does to fossil fuels.

Table 34

-- 65% of the public feel nuclear power "can be produced in almost unlimited quantities." Only 44% feel that way about coal and 28% about oil. Among leaders, only business types agree that nuclear power, more than coal, can be produced in unlimited quantities. Political leaders, regulators and environmentalists see coal as at least as available in unlimited supplies as nuclear power, if not more available.

-- 66% of the public feel that nuclear power "is a reliable form of energy for the U.S. to depend on in the long run." Moreover, 53% of the public feel it "would not run out of supply anytime soon in the future." In both respects, the public feels nuclear power surpasses oil and coal.

Attitudes toward the unlimited availability of nuclear power were measured by a final statement: "Through the use of breeder plants, plutonium, which is used to produce nuclear power, can be re-used over and over again, doing away with any possible raw material shortage." Half of the public (49%) were not able to judge this statement; those who could consider it a true statement (25% "completely", 20% "partly true"). Majorities of leaders

also feel that breeder plants would solve raw material shortages, although political and business leaders are more convinced of this than regulators and environmentalists.

Observation:

While the public does not appear to have a sophisticated understanding of breeder plants, they nonetheless are convinced that nuclear power plants will eliminate future shortages of energy to produce electric power. In its unlimited availability, the public clearly opts for nuclear energy over coal or oil. These attitudes are supported by the business community. Environmentalists, and to a lesser extent political leaders and regulators, however, credit coal with at least equal reliability and accessibility as an alternative to oil.

Independence From Foreign Sources

One in ten Americans volunteered as the major advantage of nuclear power plants that it makes us independent of foreign oil. Coal apparently shares this advantage in the public's mind:

-- 76% of the public feel nuclear power "makes us less dependent on foreign sources", and 69% say the same about coal.

-- 73% of the public feel that nuclear power "could be obtained almost entirely within the United States"; 69% feel that way about coal. As with the public, leaders are as likely to credit coal as nuclear power with this advantage.

Table 33

The public and leaders are convinced that total dependence on nuclear power for electricity would substantially cut U.S. dependence on foreign oil. This is felt by majorities of all groups, with highest agreement among business leaders, who find truth in the assertion that, "if all electric power came from nuclear power plants, this country's dependence on foreign oil could be cut by one third."

Observation:

With four out of five Americans expressing earlier their favor of our achieving energy independence from foreign sources, nuclear energy's ability to cut by one third our dependence on oil-producing nations represents an important plus in public acceptance. In this respect, however, nuclear energy enjoys little advantage over coal on this score.

Efficiency of Nuclear Plants

The public credits nuclear plants with greater efficiency than other power plants: 68% see as a "major" advantage "nuclear power plants operating more efficiently than other types of electric power plants." A comparable 72% of neighbors of such plants, who should be best informed about the efficiency of their operations, agree.

Observation:

News articles about plant shutdowns and inefficiencies have clearly not impacted heavily on public opinion. Only environmentalists, and to a much lesser extent politicians, question whether nuclear plants can match other power plants in efficiency.

Health Hazards and Risks

On the whole, the public views nuclear power plants as by far more safe than they are dangerous. By no means are they viewed as riskless, however. Only 36% of the public feel that nuclear power "raises few health hazards and dangers in using it". Yet, interestingly, the public does not consider oil and coal to be significantly safer: 45% say oil "raises few health hazards

and dangers" and 39% say the same about coal.

Table 34

On the relative safety of these three energy sources, leaders depart from the public. All four leadership groups judge oil as less likely than nuclear power to raise health hazards. As with the public, leaders judge coal to be equally as hazardous as nuclear power. In fact, political leaders find coal more hazardous.

The question of how risky is nuclear power is not resolved in the public's mind. About half of the public consider true (26% "completely", 24% "partly") the claim that the probability of a nuclear power plant accident is less likely than "being hit by a bolt of lightning." Another 19% of the public find this statement more false than true, while 31% are not sure.

Majorities of political leaders, business leaders and regulators feel certain that a nuclear accident is less likely than being struck by a bolt of lightning. Only environmentalists disagree here.

Observation:

While nuclear power plants are viewed as more safe than dangerous, the public recognizes that there is some risk involved. The public is conscious, however, of inherent dangers of alternative sources of energy as well. The extent to which the public is prepared to live with risks will be explored below.

Risks Worth Taking

"Nearly any industrial production or any products sold can run the risk of some dangers to the public," those surveyed were told. "A real question is what risks are worth taking and which are not. Let me ask you

about some. For each, do you think it is worthwhile taking the risk, or don't you think it is worthwhile taking that risk?"

Table 37

-- 80% of the public feel it is worth taking the risk of "allowing nuclear power plants to be built, if the government certifies that they will not pollute the air and water". All leaders but environmentalists agree here.

-- 79% feel that "allowing nuclear power plants to be built, if the plants meet tough government standards for nuclear waste disposal" is a risk worth taking. Again, only the environmentalists disagree.

-- 79% of the public are prepared to accept the risks of "allowing nuclear power plants to be built, if the government regularly inspects the plants to be sure there is no radioactive leakage".

-- 76% of the public feel that the following is a risk worth taking: "allowing nuclear power plants to be built, if the plants are prohibited from dumping warm water into streams and lakes that could endanger fish and other water life."

-- 75% feel that another risk worth taking is "allowing nuclear power plants to be built, if the government is satisfied on inspection that an accidental explosion is unlikely to happen."

-- An identical 75% are in favor of "allowing nuclear power plants to be built, if the plants have proper security to prevent the stealing of plutonium or the sabotage of the plants by revolutionaries." As on all the above risks, political leaders, business leaders and regulators agree that the risk is worth taking. As on all the above, environmentalists disagree.

The risks involved in building nuclear power plants appear as acceptable -- and often more acceptable -- to the public than a number of other risks that the public already lives with.

-- For example, 83% of the public feel that it is worth taking the risk of "allowing coal to be mined deep in the ground, if the mine is inspected to be sure miners will be safe from a cave-in." All leadership groups, including environmentalists, agree.

-- 80% would accept the risk of "allowing people to use sleeping pills, pep pills and tranquilizers, if they can be obtained only through a doctor who explains the dangers of misuse."

-- 69% feel it is worth the risk of "allowing liquor to be sold to adults, if the public is warned about the dangers of alcoholism". As with the above risks, majorities of all leadership groups find it worthwhile to accept the risk.

Observation:

If assured that proper safeguards and precautions are being taken, the American public is prepared to live with the risks involved in building nuclear energy plants. The public is aware that there are dangers involved -- primarily in the disposal of radioactive wastes, the escape of radioactivity, the threat of accidents or explosions, the danger of thermal pollution -- but they clearly feel that the advantages far outweigh the dangers. Top among these perceived advantages are the lower cost of electric power, the unlimited supply, greater energy independence, and the promise of more reliable and efficient energy. Public acceptance of nuclear energy is clearly conditional, however, and depends in large part on the guarantee that all steps possible to minimize the dangers of nuclear plants are being taken.

Q.7c

Table 22
TWO OR THREE MAIN DISADVANTAGES OF NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS

	Total Public %	Total Nucplant Neigh- bors %	Poli- tical Leaders %	Busi- ness Leaders %	Regu- lators %	Environ- mental- ists %
Unsafe, dangerous	23	18	16	24	15	15
Danger of radiation contamination, leaks, cracks in reactor	20	23	41	25	30	37
Danger of accidents, explosions, earthquakes	14	21	4	14	15	27
Thermal pollution, kills marine life	12	23	14	10	21	12
Problems with radioactive waste disposal	10	9	37	22	34	50
Pollution, damage to environment	9	14	14	6	15	6
Expensive, high cost	7	6	43	24	23	19
Initial expense is high; financing problems	7	7	2	12	13	8
Lack of technical knowledge, uncertainty of consequences	6	6	10	12	11	13
Need stringent controls, safeguards	5	7	6	2	4	10
Public anxiety over safety; objec- tions of environmental groups	4	10	16	22	15	4
Danger of sabotage	2	3	10	6	6	21
Sites not available	2	6	6	4	4	2
Danger to workers in nuclear plants	1	1	2	4	2	4
Puts people out of work	1	1	-	-	-	-
Inefficient, breaks down	1	1	8	2	2	12
Shortage, lack of plutonium	1	2	10	8	9	6
Length of construction time	-	-	6	8	13	-
Fuel getting into wrong hands; theft of plutonium	-	-	4	2	4	10
Exempted by government from liability claims, insurance coverage	-	-	-	-	2	8
Human carelessness, error	-	-	2	-	-	-
All other answers	5	10	14	6	11	31
None, no disadvantages	9	12	-	8	2	-
No answer	1	*	-	-	-	-
Don't know	27	14	-	-	-	-

Q.7k

Table 23
PROBLEMS CONNECTED WITH NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS

	Total Public %	Total Nucplant Neigh- bors %	Poli- tical Leaders %	Busi- ness Leaders %	Regu- lators %	Environ- mental- ists %
<u>The disposal of radioactive waste materials which remain radioactive for many centuries to come</u>						
Major problem	63	66	82	57	76	98
Minor problem	14	15	10	29	20	2
Hardly a problem at all	7	5	4	14	2	-
Not sure	16	14	4	-	2	-
<u>The escape of radioactivity into the atmosphere</u>						
Major problem	49	47	33	22	39	62
Minor problem	19	19	29	14	28	25
Hardly a problem at all	17	22	35	63	33	10
Not sure	15	12	3	1	-	3
<u>The chance of an explosion in the case of an accident</u>						
Major problem	47	45	14	18	17	45
Minor problem	28	25	37	29	43	29
Hardly a problem at all	13	20	47	51	37	20
Not sure	12	10	2	2	3	6
<u>The discharge of warm water into lakes and rivers that could endanger fish and other water life</u>						
Major problem	47	47	43	22	44	58
Minor problem	28	27	45	51	40	38
Hardly a problem at all	13	18	10	27	16	2
Not sure	12	8	2	-	-	2
<u>The threat of attempts to sabotage nuclear power plants</u>						
Major problem	39	41	38	16	26	63
Minor problem	32	26	38	60	43	33
Hardly a problem at all	16	24	22	24	28	4
Not sure	13	9	2	-	3	-

Q.7k

Table 23
PROBLEMS CONNECTED WITH NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS
(continued)

	<u>Total Public</u> %	<u>Total Nucplant Neigh- bors</u> %	<u>Politi- cal Leaders</u> %	<u>Busi- ness Leaders</u> %	<u>Regu- lators</u> %	<u>Environ- mental- ists</u> %
<u>Giving off fumes that can pollute the air</u>						
Major problem	36	34	12	6	13	15
Minor problem	26	19	37	27	24	35
Hardly a problem at all	21	36	49	65	58	44
Not sure	17	11	2	2	5	6
<u>The possibility that plutonium, which is made in a nuclear power plant, could be stolen by radical revolutionaries</u>						
Major problem	34	34	48	20	33	77
Minor problem	29	21	28	47	47	19
Hardly a problem at all	18	28	24	33	20	4
Not sure	19	17	-	-	-	-

Table 24
 "MAJOR" PROBLEMS CONNECTED WITH NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS

	Total Public %	Mid-				Sub-				18- 30- and 50			Some High School or Less %	High School Grad./ Some Col- lege Grad.		Building More Nuclear Power Plants in U.S.	
		East %	west %	South %	West %	Cities %	urbs %	Towns %	Rural %	29 %	49 %	Over %		lege %	Grad. %	Favor %	Oppose %
The disposal of radio- active waste materials which remain radio- active for many cen- turies to come	63	67	67	55	62	64	65	58	63	72	62	56	53	67	72	58	86
The escape of radio- activity into the atmosphere	49	57	53	43	40	55	48	42	47	61	48	40	46	51	49	41	76
The chance of an ex- plosion in the case of an accident	47	55	45	47	36	50	45	40	49	51	48	43	51	46	38	38	70
The discharge of warm water into lakes and rivers that could en- danger fish and other water life	47	49	52	41	42	53	43	44	45	50	45	45	45	46	53	40	72
The threat of attempts to sabotage nuclear power plants	39	42	39	38	37	42	38	41	38	38	40	40	44	38	32	35	53
Giving off fumes that can can pollute the air	36	42	34	36	30	43	31	33	35	47	33	31	39	36	27	27	61
The possibility that plutonium, which is made in a nuclear power plant, could be stolen by radical revolutionaries	34	38	33	30	35	38	33	35	30	36	35	32	34	35	31	31	49

Table 25
 "MAJOR" PROBLEMS CONNECTED WITH NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS

	Total Public %	Estimate of Public Opinion by:			
		Poli- tical Leaders %	Busi- ness Leaders %	Regu- lators %	Environ- mental- ists %
The disposal of radioactive waste materials which remain radioactive for many centuries to come	63	67	68	60	67
The escape of radioactivity into the atmosphere	49	71	64	72	56
The chance of an explosion in the case of an accident	47	56	64	68	46
The discharge of warm water into lakes and rivers that could endanger fish and other water life	47	20	56	45	17
The threat of attempts to sabotage nuclear power plants	39	40	34	38	33
Giving off fumes that can pollute the air	36	18	34	30	18
The possibility that plutonium, which is made in a nuclear power plant, could be stolen by radical revolutionaries	34	47	32	36	50

Q.7q(2)

Table 26
NEGATIVE STATEMENTS ABOUT NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS

	Total Public %	Total Nucplant Neigh- bors %	Politi- cal Leaders %	Busi- ness Leaders %	Regu- lators %	Environ- mental- ists %
<u>A major radiation leakage from a nuclear power plant can cause fall-out that can kill large numbers of people</u>						
Completely true	36	46	29	22	32	71
Partly true	27	21	27	22	30	21
Partly untrue	6	8	16	18	26	6
Completely untrue	6	8	22	33	9	2
Not sure	25	17	6	5	3	-
<u>Hot water from nuclear power plants endangers fish and other water life in nearby lakes and streams</u>						
Completely true	33	44	35	20	35	50
Partly true	33	24	49	39	54	48
Partly untrue	5	8	8	20	7	2
Completely untrue	5	11	8	18	2	-
Not sure	24	13	-	3	2	-
<u>Waste from nuclear power plants can cause radioactivity exposure to too many people</u>						
Completely true	25	32	26	16	26	67
Partly true	29	21	36	8	28	25
Partly untrue	11	10	24	20	19	2
Completely untrue	9	15	14	51	23	4
Not sure	26	22	-	5	4	2
<u>If nuclear power were being produced all over the country, some revolutionaries or criminals could steal nuclear materials and make their own atom bombs</u>						
Completely true	21	24	28	10	15	60
Partly true	34	26	36	31	43	31
Partly untrue	11	12	12	24	21	4
Completely untrue	13	23	24	29	17	2
Not sure	21	15	-	6	4	3
<u>A nuclear power plant can fail and the nuclear materials can come together to cause a massive nuclear explosion</u>						
Completely true	17	23	6	6	9	21
Partly true	22	19	12	12	17	12
Partly untrue	9	7	16	2	9	8
Completely untrue	15	21	59	55	53	52
Not sure	37	30	7	25	12	7

7n(1)

Table 27
HOW SAFE ARE NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS

	<u>Very Safe</u> %	<u>Somewhat Safe</u> %	<u>Not so Safe</u> %	<u>Dangerous (Volunteered)</u> %	<u>Not Sure</u> %
<u>Total Public</u>	<u>26</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>18</u>
East	26	36	16	6	16
Midwest	22	45	12	6	15
South	25	36	12	3	24
West	32	38	9	6	15
Some H.S. or less	19	34	14	4	29
H.S. grad/some college	28	41	12	6	13
College grad	35	41	10	8	6
Men	38	35	10	5	12
Women	15	42	15	5	23
Favor more nucplants in U.S.	39	45	5	1	10
Oppose more nucplants in U.S.	4	31	34	22	9
<u>Total Nucplant Neighbors</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>38</u>	<u>12</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>
Indian Point, N.Y.	25	44	16	9	6
Morris, Ill.	33	38	14	5	10
San Onofre, Calif.	48	32	5	7	8

Table 28
HOW SAFE ARE NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS

	<u>Total Public</u> %	<u>Total Nucplant Neigh- bors</u> %	<u>Poli- tical Leaders</u> %	<u>Busi- ness Leaders</u> %	<u>Regu- lators</u> %	<u>Environ- mental- ists</u> %
Very safe	26	35	50	67	49	10
Somewhat safe	38	38	22	25	34	25
Not so safe	13	12	22	4	13	44
Dangerous (vol.)	5	7	6	2	2	19
Not sure	18	8	-	2	2	2

Q.16b

Table 29
SAFETY OF NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS

	Total Public	Estimate of Public Opinion by:			
		Political Leaders	Business Leaders	Regulators	Environmentalists
	%	%	%	%	%
Very safe	26	6	10	2	12
Somewhat safe	38	54	46	68	47
Not so safe	13	34	42	28	33
Dangerous (vol.)	5	4	2	2	-
Not sure	18	2	-	-	8

Q.7o

Table 30
WHY FEEL NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS ARE SAFE/UNSAFE

	Total Public %	Total Nucplant Neigh- bors %	Poli- tical Leaders %	Busi- ness Leaders %	Regu- lators %	Environ- mental- ists %
<u>Reasons Why Nuclear Power Plants Are Safe</u>						
Haven't heard of any accidents; record of plants is good	12	24	27	47	30	12
There are many precautions, efforts to keep them safe	8	15	25	29	26	8
I have confidence in people, scientists who work on them	8	6	4	18	9	8
They wouldn't be built if not safe; they must be safe	7	5	-	-	-	-
I just feel they're safe; not worried	6	2	2	2	2	-
I've read, heard they are safe	6	3	4	10	13	2
They're safe as long as handled properly; as long as constant precautions are taken	4	5	-	2	-	-
No fumes; don't pollute	1	4	-	2	2	-
I, relative, friend work(ed) in nuclear plant	1	3	-	2	-	-
The only problem is waste disposal; fish killed	1	1	-	-	-	-
I live near one	*	7	2	-	-	-
Potential good of nuclear energy is worth the risks, dangers	-	-	14	12	15	4
They must conform to standards, regulations, of AEC, NAC, etc.	-	-	2	4	4	2
All other reasons why safe	2	4	-	8	2	-
<u>Reasons Why Nuclear Power Plants Are Unsafe</u>						
Don't know all the consequences, how safe or dangerous it is; need more research	11	4	4	10	9	6
Danger of radiation, leakage	10	8	10	2	6	17
Danger of explosions, accidents, breakdowns	8	12	16	4	15	19
It's dangerous, unsafe	6	2	4	-	2	15
Nothing is foolproof; always chance of human error	6	3	2	4	9	12
Bad for environment; causes pollution	4	4	2	-	-	6
Have read, heard about problems, dangers, etc.	4	3	4	2	2	12
Problems with radioactive wastes	3	5	20	4	9	29

(continued)

Table 30

WHY FEEL NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS ARE SAFE/UNSAFE (Continued)

	Total Public %	Total Nucplant Neigh- bors %	Poli- tical Leaders %	Busi- ness Leaders %	Regu- lators %	Environ- mental- ists %
<u>Reasons Why Nuclear Power Plants Are Unsafe</u>						
Thermal pollution	3	4	6	-	2	-
Danger of sabotage	2	3	6	2	2	13
They don't take proper precautions	2	1	-	-	2	2
It's like an atomic bomb	1	2	2	-	-	4
They won't tell us if something goes wrong	1	1	2	-	2	17
Have had problems in plants around here	*	2	-	-	-	-
Inadequate engineering, technical capabilities	-	-	2	-	9	27
Problems, accidents in transport of hazardous materials	-	-	2	-	6	8
Theft of radioactive materials for crime, blackmail	-	-	-	-	4	4
Although nuclear energy causes fewer accidents, the consequences of accidents are worse	-	-	2	-	-	6
Problems in storage of hazardous material	-	-	2	-	2	2
All other reasons why unsafe	2	*	2	-	2	8
<u>No Answer</u>	4	*	-	-	-	4
<u>Don't Know</u>	16	9	2	2	2	-

Q.7d

Table 31
TWO OR THREE MAIN ADVANTAGES OF NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS

	Total Public %	Total Nucplant Neigh- bors %	Poli- tical Leaders %	Busi- ness Leaders %	Regu- lators %	Environ- mental- ists %
Cheap, produced more cheaply, less expensive to use	31	37	33	51	51	23
Clean energy, less pollution than gas, oil, coal	25	36	55	51	57	31
Unlimited supply, abundant source, reusable	21	15	41	53	38	29
More powerful, efficient; high output of energy	12	8	8	16	13	4
Make U.S. independent of foreign oil	11	16	14	12	17	-
Alternative to gas, oil, coal	8	5	12	4	11	2
We need energy; good source of energy	7	13	2	2	2	4
Cheaper in the long run	7	13	-	2	6	-
Helps save natural resources	5	4	4	12	6	6
Would create jobs	4	7	-	-	-	2
More reliable, dependable	2	4	4	4	4	2
Favor, if safe, properly controlled	2	3	2	-	-	2
Compact, self-contained; less storage space necessary	2	2	2	4	-	4
It's available immediately	2	1	6	2	4	2
Progress; modern, advanced technology	2	2	4	8	4	6
It's safer; not dangerous	1	4	4	2	4	2
Could be built anywhere	*	1	-	-	4	2
They'll solve waste disposal problems	*	-	-	-	-	-
Favor, if built away from populated areas	*	1	-	-	-	-
Easy transportation of fuel	-	-	4	4	2	2
All other answers	4	6	4	6	2	4
None, no advantages	5	5	4	2	2	35
No answer	1	1	-	-	-	2
Don't know	20	12	-	-	-	-

Q.7L

Table 32
ADVANTAGES OF NUCLEAR POWER

	Total Public %	Total Nucplant Neigh- bors %	Politi- cal Leaders %	Busi- ness Leaders %	Regu- lators %	Environ- mental- ists %
<u>Having nuclear power plants which produce cheaper electric power</u>						
Major advantage	79	82	56	90	70	27
Minor advantage	10	8	14	6	11	13
No advantage at all	3	3	28	-	17	54
Not sure	8	7	2	4	2	6
<u>Once constructed, nuclear power plants producing less expensive electricity</u>						
Major advantage	75	75	48	90	76	23
Minor advantage	9	9	14	10	9	17
No advantage at all	4	5	30	-	13	54
Not sure	12	11	8	-	2	6
<u>Eventually, nuclear power plants using the same energy over and over again, eliminating any future shortage of energy to produce electric power</u>						
Major advantage	74	74	68	82	64	31
Minor advantage	9	7	14	2	6	18
No advantage at all	2	3	14	6	23	45
Not sure	15	16	4	10	7	6
<u>Building nuclear power plants away from heavily residential areas and still bringing cheaper power to people where they live</u>						
Major advantage	72	77	38	55	45	16
Minor advantage	15	15	32	27	32	22
No advantage at all	4	4	30	18	23	62
Not sure	9	4	-	-	-	-
<u>Nuclear power plants operating more efficiently than other types of electric power plants</u>						
Major advantage	68	72	46	76	57	25
Minor advantage	13	10	18	8	17	12
No advantage at all	5	6	32	10	20	63
Not sure	14	12	4	6	6	-

(Continued)

Table 32

ADVANTAGES OF NUCLEAR POWER (Continued)

	Total Public %	Total Nucplant Neigh- bors %	Poli- tical Leaders %	Busi- ness Leaders %	Regu- lators %	Environ- mental- ists %
<u>A nuclear power plant attracting new industry to an area and creating more jobs</u>						
Major advantage	66	69	26	51	28	12
Minor advantage	18	19	54	33	38	25
No advantage at all	7	7	20	16	32	63
Not sure	9	5	-	-	2	-
<u>Nuclear power plants being a major peaceful benefit from all the money this country has spent on atomic energy</u>						
Major advantage	65	62	32	63	60	17
Minor advantage	16	17	50	22	23	23
No advantage at all	5	7	14	14	15	58
Not sure	14	14	4	1	2	2
<u>Nuclear power plants creating no pollution of the air and water, such as that created by electric power plants using oil or coal</u>						
Major advantage	63	70	57	75	62	40
Minor advantage	16	10	29	12	28	29
No advantage at all	7	11	14	12	9	29
Not sure	14	9	-	1	1	2
<u>Locating nuclear power plants in undeveloped areas of the country where new industry can be built and new cities built</u>						
Major advantage	56	62	22	53	34	10
Minor advantage	21	19	48	29	40	15
No advantage at all	10	9	30	18	26	75
Not sure	13	10	-	-	-	-

Table 33
POSITIVE STATEMENTS ABOUT NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS

	Total Public %	Total Nucplant Neigh- bors %	Poli- tical Leaders %	Busi- ness Leaders %	Regu- lators %	Environ- mental- ists %
<u>If all electric power came from nuclear power plants, this country's dependence on foreign oil could be cut by one third</u>						
Completely true	47	54	43	65	49	38
Partly true	24	20	33	18	28	17
Partly untrue	3	2	4	4	6	8
Completely untrue	2	1	10	6	4	17
Not sure	24	23	10	7	13	20
<u>Nuclear power for electric power can be produced more cheaply than oil</u>						
Completely true	38	48	36	57	38	12
Partly true	21	16	20	22	32	27
Partly untrue	3	3	16	12	11	17
Completely untrue	4	4	22	-	13	38
Not sure	34	29	6	9	6	6
<u>Nuclear power actually pollutes far less than electric power produced from oil/coal</u>						
Completely true	35	44	51	67	55	19
Partly true	27	22	33	20	30	38
Partly untrue	5	4	6	4	4	17
Completely untrue	4	6	6	-	4	25
Not sure	29	24	4	9	7	1
<u>The probability of a nuclear power plant accident is less likely than being hit by a bolt of lightning</u>						
Completely true	26	32	62	57	62	23
Partly true	24	22	16	22	21	12
Partly untrue	11	8	4	6	4	8
Completely untrue	8	10	6	4	4	37
Not sure	31	28	12	11	9	20
<u>Through the use of breeder plants, plutonium, which is used to produce nuclear power, can be re-used over and over again, doing away with any possible raw material shortage</u>						
Completely true	25	29	41	43	26	25
Partly true	20	16	35	27	40	44
Partly untrue	3	3	10	4	2	13
Completely untrue	3	2	8	2	13	15
Not sure	49	50	6	24	19	3

(Continued)

Table 33

POSITIVE STATEMENTS ABOUT NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS (Continued)

	<u>Total Public</u> %	<u>Total Nucplant Neigh- bors</u> %	<u>Poli- tical Leaders</u> %	<u>Busi- ness Leaders</u> %	<u>Regu- lators</u> %	<u>Environ- mental- ists</u> %
Some communities have had nuclear power plants for as long as 14 years and have had cheaper power and no health problems						
Completely true	23	30	37	53	39	23
Partly true	18	18	33	29	24	31
Partly untrue	3	4	6	6	20	17
Completely untrue	3	6	4	-	-	13
Not sure	53	42	20	12	17	16

Table 34
ADVANTAGES OF OIL, COAL AND NUCLEAR POWER
AS ENERGY SOURCES FOR ELECTRIC POWER
("Think so" only)

	Total Public %	Political Leaders %	Business Leaders %	Regulators %	Environmentalists %
<u>Raises few health hazards and dangers in using it</u>					
Oil	45	57	82	64	40
Coal	39	27	53	48	17
Nuclear power	36	44	51	43	12
<u>Makes us less dependent on foreign sources</u>					
Oil	40	20	18	28	29
Coal	69	98	88	94	83
Nuclear power	76	96	96	87	69
<u>Could be obtained almost entirely within the United States</u>					
Oil	38	6	10	13	10
Coal	69	100	96	96	94
Nuclear power	73	80	86	89	77
<u>Would not run out of supply anytime soon in the future</u>					
Oil	33	33	39	30	31
Coal	45	74	73	72	83
Nuclear power	53	60	84	67	51
<u>Is a reliable form of energy for the U.S. to depend on in the long run</u>					
Oil	30	14	18	9	2
Coal	42	78	71	74	61
Nuclear power	66	68	82	81	21
<u>Can be produced in almost unlimited quantities</u>					
Oil	28	2	4	2	6
Coal	44	74	75	60	56
Nuclear power	65	53	88	60	38
<u>Is a clean source of energy and doesn't pollute the water so much</u>					
Oil	24	37	71	47	42
Coal	24	31	51	35	37
Nuclear power	44	45	73	50	23
<u>Is a clean source of energy and doesn't pollute the air so much</u>					
Oil	24	25	57	46	33
Coal	10	10	8	9	10
Nuclear power	57	71	92	87	31
<u>Will be a cheaper form of energy in the future than it is now</u>					
Oil	18	16	6	6	8
Coal	28	20	22	19	24
Nuclear power	53	39	61	32	25

Table 35
ADVANTAGES OF OIL, COAL AND NUCLEAR POWER
AS ENERGY SOURCES FOR ELECTRIC POWER

	Total Public		
	Oil	Coal	Nuclear
	%	%	%
<u>Raises few health hazards and dangers in using it</u>			
Think so	45	39	36
Don't think so	38	46	31
Not sure	17	15	33
<u>Makes us less dependent on foreign sources</u>			
Think so	40	69	76
Don't think so	49	21	7
Not sure	11	10	17
<u>Could be obtained almost entirely within the United States</u>			
Think so	38	69	73
Don't think so	50	19	7
Not sure	12	12	20
<u>Would not run out of supply anytime soon in the future</u>			
Think so	33	45	53
Don't think so	52	42	22
Not sure	15	13	25
<u>Is a reliable form of energy for the U.S. to depend on in the long run</u>			
Think so	30	42	66
Don't think so	57	44	9
Not sure	13	14	25
<u>Can be produced in almost unlimited quantities</u>			
Think so	28	44	65
Don't think so	58	42	10
Not sure	14	14	25
<u>Is a clean source of energy and doesn't pollute the water so much</u>			
Think so	24	24	44
Don't think so	61	61	25
Not sure	15	15	31
<u>Is a clean source of energy and doesn't pollute the air so much</u>			
Think so	24	10	57
Don't think so	63	81	14
Not sure	13	9	29
<u>Will be a cheaper form of energy in the future than it is now</u>			
Think so	18	28	53
Don't think so	69	56	21
Not sure	13	16	26

Q.15a

Table 36

ADVANTAGES OF NUCLEAR POWER AS ENERGY SOURCE FOR ELECTRIC POWER

	Total Public %	Estimate of Public Opinion by:			
		Politi- cal Leaders %	Busi- ness Leaders %	Regu- lators %	Environ- mental- ists %
Makes us <u>less</u> dependent on foreign sources	76	94	90	91	88
Could be obtained almost entirely within the United States	73	94	84	89	79
Is a reliable form of energy for the U.S. to depend on in the long run	66	52	60	79	38
Can be produced in almost unlimited quantities	65	66	60	66	62
Is a clean source of energy and doesn't pollute the air so much	57	55	46	60	54
Will be a cheaper form of energy in the future than it is now	53	51	52	53	46
Would not run out of supply anytime soon in the future	53	88	80	85	73
Is a clean source of energy and doesn't pollute the water so much	44	43	38	40	46
Raises few health hazards and dangers in using it	36	31	14	15	21

Q.7p

Table 37
RISKS WORTH TAKING

	<u>Total Public %</u>	<u>Total Nucplant Neigh- bors %</u>	<u>Politi- cal Leaders %</u>	<u>Busi- ness Leaders %</u>	<u>Regu- lators %</u>	<u>Environ- mental- ists %</u>
Allowing people to use natural gas in their homes, if precautions are required to make sure leakage will not asphyxiate people or cause an explosion	85	88	96	94	98	100
Allowing automobiles to be sold, if the federal government checks up on how safe they are and requires manufacturers to call back defective cars to be fixed	85	87	98	100	98	92
Allowing coal to be mined deep in the ground, if the mine is inspected to be sure miners will be safe from a cave-in	83	79	98	98	96	94
Allowing people to use sleeping pills, pep pills, and tranquilizers, if they can be obtained only through a doctor who explains the dangers of misuse	80	74	94	96	94	90
* Allowing nuclear power plants to be built, if the government certifies that they will not pollute the air and water	80	81	73	94	85	27
* Allowing nuclear power plants to be built, if the government regularly inspects the plant to be sure there is no radioactive leakage	79	77	80	92	85	25
* Allowing nuclear power plants to be built, if the plants meet tough government standards for nuclear waste disposal	79	80	74	94	87	27
* Allowing nuclear power plants to be built, if the plants are prohibited from dumping warm water into streams and lakes that could endanger fish and other water life	76	71	84	92	87	33
* Allowing nuclear power plants to be built, if the government is satisfied on inspection that an accidental explosion is unlikely to happen	75	77	66	90	81	21

(continued)

Table 37
RISKS WORTH TAKING (Continued)

	<u>Total Public %</u>	<u>Total Nucplant Neigh- bors %</u>	<u>Poli- tical Leaders %</u>	<u>Busi- ness Leaders %</u>	<u>Regu- lators %</u>	<u>Environ- mental- ists %</u>
* Allowing nuclear power plants to be built, if the plants have proper security to prevent the stealing of plutonium or the sabotage of the plants by revolutionaries	75	75	78	94	85	29
Allowing liquor to be sold to adults, if the public is warned about the dangers of alcoholism	69	78	94	94	91	92
Allowing cigarettes to be sold, if the packages have a clear warning of the dangers of cigarette smoking	68	77	86	90	83	87
Allowing strip mining for coal to tear up the ground surface, if the coal producer is required to reclaim the land after using it	68	71	90	92	91	75
Allowing prescribed drugs that can kill people from overdose to be sold, if the package warns people about the dangers of excessive use	62	66	96	80	85	87
Allowing synthetic fabrics to be sold for clothes, curtains and rugs, if people are warned of the dangers of such fabrics catching fire	55	51	45	69	57	50

SECTION III:

NUCLEAR POWER IN OWN COMMUNITY

More Nuclear Plants in the United States

When all the assets and liabilities of nuclear power are tallied, the bottom line is strong public support for the building of more nuclear plants in this country. By 63 to 19%, the American public is in favor of "the building of more nuclear power plants in the United States."

Q.7a

FAVOR/OPOSE THE BUILDING OF MORE NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS
IN THE UNITED STATES

	Total Public	Total Nucplant Neigh- bors	Poli- tical Leaders	Busi- ness Leaders	Regu- lators	Environ- mental- ists
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Favor	63	63	69	92	75	19
Oppose	19	23	29	6	19	77
Not sure	18	14	2	2	6	4

Table 38

Support for more nuclear plants runs lower in the East (58%) than in other parts of the country, and highest in the West (68%). Support is higher among the better educated, the affluent and whites than among the less well educated, the less affluent and blacks. Men (73%) voice far greater support for nuclear power than women (54%), one-fourth of whom have not made up their minds as yet. Age appears to have no effect, however, on support for nuclear energy; the 18 to 29 group (64%) registers the same support as those 50 and over (63%).

Neighbors of nuclear power plants are as much in favor of building more plants as is the public at large. The degree of support varies, however, from one nuclear plant neighborhood to another. Residents of San Onofre, California (75%) express far greater support than residents of either Indian Point, New York (56%) or Morris, Illinois (58%).

Support for more nuclear plants in the country runs highest among business leaders (92%), who throughout the survey have been the most outspoken on the advantages of nuclear energy. Political leaders (69%) and regulators (75%) express their favor for more nuclear plants; only environmentalists express strong opposition (by 77 to 19%). (See page 77.)

The 63% of the public who are in favor of building more plants explain why they feel that way:

Table 39

-- 21% say that it "would help solve the energy crisis; alternative to other sources; we're running out of oil, gas, coal."

-- 15% mention that it is "cheap, less expensive."

-- 13% that nuclear energy is a "better source of energy; the source of energy of the future."

-- 10% that it is "clean energy; less pollution than oil, coal, gas."

-- 9% that it "makes the U.S. self-sufficient, independent from foreign energy sources."

-- And 8% refer to its "unlimited, abundant supply."

In the words of a 54-year-old skilled craftsman from Brooklyn, New York:

"It would eliminate the shortage of energy. It would cut down on imports. It would be cheaper than importing oil."

A 41-year-old manager in Dallas, Texas feels:

"Nuclear power has less pollution. We will not run out of supply in the foreseeable future. The raw materials needed to produce nuclear power are not consumable as with oil or coal."

According to a 27-year-old craftsman in Garland, Texas:

"I think nuclear power plants can be built and operated safely. The ratio between the amount of energy produced and the materials needed is greater than with other sources."

-- Neighbors of nuclear plants (24%) are more likely than the public at large to refer to lower cost as their main reason for supporting the construction of more nuclear plants.

-- Lower cost is also the primary reason volunteered by business leaders (30%), followed by unlimited supply (26%) and clean energy (24%).

-- Political leaders' reasons focus on a way to help solve the energy crisis (16%), cheaper cost (16%), and better source of energy (16%).

-- The main reasons for regulators' support are clean energy (28%), cheaper cost (28%), and it will help solve the energy crisis (26%).

-- The only reason why some environmentalists would support the building of more nuclear plants is to help solve the energy crisis (13%).

In the words of the commissioner of conservation of a Southern state:

"I'd be in favor of it to make other fuels available for other uses than electrical power generation -- natural gas for the petro-chemical industry, fertilizers and plastics and oil for automobiles, airplanes and farm equipment. We need to release the fuels for other purposes."

The head of a federal regulatory agency gives the following reason:

"It would prove to be more reliable and economical to have a large portion of our power needs produced by nuclear power plants. We'd be less dependent on foreign supplies, and would conserve oil and natural gas."

Says the vice president for public relations of a major Midwestern company:

"It's the most economical and effective way of producing energy. As far as the health, safety and environmental threats are concerned, I feel it is a trade-off."

The primary reason volunteered by the 19% of the public opposed to building more nuclear plants is "it's dangerous, unsafe; hazardous to health."

In the words of a 40-year-old black operative in Pontiac, Michigan:

"They seem to be dangerous. There's too much talk about pollution and killing people by explosion."

A 33-year-old laborer in Vicksburg, Michigan:

"It is very dangerous to us and to the environment. There's no need for it if we use solar energy."

The primary overall reasons for opposing more power plants in the United States center around the dangers and health hazards, and the problems with radioactive wastes. In addition, environmentalists make frequent reference to radiation leakage and to the danger of sabotage.

Said the legislative director of a major environmental group:

"If we have any alternative to nuclear power, we should take it. There are problems with the management and storage of radioactive wastes, with the safety and reliability of nuclear power plants, with the increased cost of nuclear power, problems with sabotage and the safe-guarding of nuclear plants and materials, especially plutonium."

Table 41

On the whole, then, there is strong public support for more nuclear plants, far more support than leaders imagine. In all cases, leaders underestimate public favor here: while 63% of the public are in favor of more plants in the United States, only 42% of political leaders expect them to feel that way.

Observation:

Contrary to the expectations of all leadership groups surveyed, the American public expresses firm support of the building of more nuclear power plants in the United States. Strongest support comes from the West, with the East in favor of it by a slimmer majority. Support runs highest among the well educated and the affluent. Among leaders, business leaders voice strongest support, with environmentalists in loud opposition.

Nuclear Power In Own Community

Although the public may be in favor of the building of more nuclear plants in the country as a whole, people are willing to live with nuclear power in their own community -- but not as decisively as their commitment for the nation. When put to the test, public support drops only 9 points; by 54% to 24%, the public would favor "having nuclear power as the main source of energy for electric power in your community":

7a,e

	Total Public %	Total Nucplant Neigh- bors %	Poli- tical Leaders %	Busi- ness Leaders %	Regu- lators %	Environ- mental- ists %
<u>Building More Nuclear Power Plants In The United States</u>						
Favor	63	63	69	92	75	19
Oppose	19	23	29	6	19	77
Not sure	18	14	2	2	6	4
<u>Having Nuclear Power As Main Source Of Energy For Electric Power In Your Community</u>						
Favor	54	61	57	88	68	22
Oppose	24	22	39	6	32	76
Not sure	22	17	4	6	-	2

Support for having nuclear power as a main source of energy in your community runs higher among those who already live near nuclear plants than among the public at large. Once again, however, those in San Onofre (72% in favor) express greater support than residents of either Indian Point (54%) or Morris (57%).

Opposition to having a nuclear plant in their own community is highest among environmentalists, 76% of whom voiced their opposition. Thirty-nine percent of political leaders and 32% of regulators would be opposed.

As with support for more plants nationwide, support for nuclear power in one's own community runs lower in the East (49%) than in other parts of the country. While support for nuclear power in the country at large does not vary by size of place, support for a plant in one's own

community runs higher in the suburbs (60%) than in cities (53%), towns (51%) and rural areas (50%). Support increases with affluence and with education. This does not mean, however, that the less affluent or less well educated are more opposed. Instead, as with blacks and women, they are more undecided.

Not surprisingly, support for nuclear power in one's own community runs much higher among those who consider it safe than among those who consider it unsafe. Among those who consider it safe, there are 16% who would still be opposed to relying on it as the main source of electric power in their community. Conversely, 15% of those who consider it unsafe would nevertheless favor it in their own community.

Table 43

The 54% of the public who would favor reliance on nuclear power as the main source of community electricity look to it primarily as a cheaper source of power (24% volunteered this reason), a cleaner source of energy (13%), and an unlimited source of energy (8%). Neighbors of nuclear plants are even more committed than the public to the notion that nuclear power is more economical and cleaner than energy from fossil fuels.

The 24% of the public who would oppose reliance on nuclear power in their community mention primarily that it is dangerous or hazardous (10%), and that we should use alternative energy sources (5%). Three percent of the public, but a higher 8% of neighbors of nuclear plants, express fear of radiation leakage.

Observation:

Living with nuclear power has left residents of nuclear plant neighborhoods more convinced than the public at large that nuclear energy is a cheaper and cleaner source of energy. Again, the results show that neighbors of nuclear plants are more comfortable than the public at large with reliance on nuclear energy as the main source of electric power in their community.

Table 44

Under certain conditions, locating a nuclear power plant in their community would be more acceptable to that portion of the public who are otherwise opposed or undecided.

-- "If it were located offshore or in a place where not many people live," 45% of those otherwise opposed (and 55% of those unsure) would favor locating a nuclear plant in their area. Among the public at large, 74% would favor a nuclear plant under this condition.

-- "If a special report of scientists said it was safe to be built and to be operated," 42% of those otherwise opposed (and 55% of those undecided) would favor a local nuclear plant. Seventy-three percent of the total public would be in favor of a nuclear plant in their community if such a report were published.

-- Stable electric rates would also sway some current opponents of nuclear power. Forty-four percent of those opposed (and 59% of the undecided group) would favor a nuclear plant in their area "if it meant that electric power rates would not be going up for many years." In all, 72% of the public would opt for a local nuclear power plant if it meant no increase in electric rates.

-- The attraction of more jobs in the area would change the minds of some opponents. "If it meant new industry would be attracted here, which would provide more jobs", 39% of those previously opposed (and 52% of those undecided) would favor locating a nuclear plant in their area. Sixty-nine percent of the public would favor a nuclear plant nearby if it would attract new industry and jobs.

Under other conditions, however, previous majority support for nuclear energy would drop to only minority levels.

-- "If Ralph Nader opposed it," only 39% of the public (and 61% of those who previously favored a local nuclear plant) would favor locating a nuclear power plant in their area. (A large segment of the public is clearly unaware of Ralph Nader's campaign for a moratorium on building nuclear plants.)

-- "If (their) local government opposed it," only 37% of the public (and 58% of those who would otherwise be in favor) would opt for a local nuclear power plant. Similarly, "if (their) state government opposed it," only 35% of the public would be in favor of nuclear power.

-- Evidence of polluting effects would also lead to opposition to nuclear power. "If it were declared by environmentalists to have a bad polluting effect on the environment," public support would drop to a 23% level.

-- Safety remains the primary concern. "If it were reported as unsafe by federal government regulatory agencies," only 12% of the public would continue to favor the location of a nuclear power plant in their area.

Table 45

The business community exhibits in this series its almost unqualified support for nuclear power. If Ralph Nader opposed it, if their local or state government opposed it, if it were declared by environmentalists to have a bad polluting effect on the environment, majorities of business leaders would nonetheless continue to favor nuclear power in their area. Majorities of regulators (though, in all cases, slimmer ones) would also continue to favor nuclear power under those same conditions.

The strong opposition of environmentalists is heard once again. Even if it were located offshore, if a special scientific report declared it safe, if it meant stable electric rates, or if it meant more local industry and jobs, no more than one in five environmentalists would favor locating a nuclear power plant in their community.

Observation:

Location offshore, scientific testimony of plant safety, promise of stable electric rates, and the attraction of new industry and jobs would all help to increase the already majority public support for the building of nuclear plants in their area.

On the other hand, Ralph Nader and environmentalists who have engaged in outspoken attacks on nuclear power could potentially have a major influence on public attitudes toward nuclear plants. Their campaigns have as yet failed to reach much of the public, however.

The Economic Dimension of Nuclear Power

Table 46

Today's inflationary economy and high unemployment rates will clearly impact on public attraction to nuclear energy. There appears to be no doubt in the public's mind that nuclear power will have a positive effect on their own pocketbook. Sixty-seven percent of the public (and 56% of those opposed to nuclear energy in their community) feel that building a nuclear power plant would make it "more likely" that more new business would come to the community and create jobs. In the public's mind, nuclear plants hold the promise of more jobs: 58% of the public (and 43% of those opposed to a local nuclear plant) feel that a local nuclear plant would be "more likely" to make the community "a better place to find a job."

Table 48

Again, nuclear power represents to the public lower priced electricity: 61% of the public (43% of those opposed to local nuclear plants) feel that a nuclear plant in their own community would make it "more likely" that electric power would be a better buy for the money. A cost saving is by no means the sole attraction of nuclear energy. Fifty-five percent of the public feel that it would be worthwhile to have a nuclear power plant in their own community "if it meant that electric power rates would be about the same as other types of power." In fact, 31% would find nuclear power worthwhile even if it meant spending 10% more on electricity.

Table 49

There is no question, however, that the cost factor is an important one in winning over opponents of nuclear energy. For a 15% savings in the cost of electricity, a 53% majority of those otherwise opposed would find it worthwhile to have a nuclear power plant in their own community. For a 25% savings, 60% of that group would find a nuclear plant worthwhile.

For a 50% savings, a full 68% of those otherwise opposed to nuclear power in their community would be in favor of locating a plant nearby.

For two in five Americans, the location of a nuclear power plant in their community is perceived as a major benefit. Forty-two percent of Table 46 the public felt that building a nuclear power plant would make their community a better place to live, although 17% said it would make them less likely to view their community in that way.

Observation:

The public is clearly convinced that nuclear power is economically advantageous. In times like these, the promise of more jobs and lower electric rates -- two assets which the public believes nuclear power will bring -- is appealing enough to convert opponents into supporters of nuclear power plants in their own community.

Q.7a(1)

Table 36

FAVOR/OPOSE THE BUILDING OF MORE NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS
IN THE UNITED STATES

	<u>Favor</u> %	<u>Oppose</u> %	<u>Not Sure</u> %
<u>Total Public</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>19</u>	<u>18</u>
East	58	23	19
Midwest	65	18	17
South	64	15	21
West	68	18	14
Cities	64	21	15
Suburbs	65	18	17
Towns	63	19	18
Rural	62	16	22
18-29 years	64	22	14
30-49 years	64	20	16
50 years and over	63	15	22
Some H.S. or less	57	15	28
H.S. grad/some college	66	20	14
College grad	68	23	9
Under \$5,000	52	20	28
\$5,000-\$9,999	61	17	22
\$10,000-\$14,999	64	20	16
\$15,000 and over	71	19	10
White	65	19	16
Black	55	17	28
Men	73	16	11
Women	54	21	25
<u>Total Nucplant Neighbors</u>	<u>63</u>	<u>23</u>	<u>14</u>
Indian Point, N.Y.	56	28	16
Morris, Ill.	58	25	17
San Onofre, Calif.	75	17	8
<u>Nucpower in Own Community</u>			
Main energy source	64	25	11
Not main energy source	69	20	11

Table 39
REASONS WHY FAVOR THE BUILDING OF MORE NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS IN THE UNITED STATES

	Total Public %	Total Nucplant Neighbors %	Political Leaders %	Business Leaders %	Regulators %	Environmentalists %
Reasons Why Favor (Base: Those who favor)	(63%)	(63%)	(69%)	(92%)	(75%)	(19%)
Help solve energy crisis; alternative to other sources; we're running out of oil, gas, coal	21	18	16	22	26	13
Cheap, less expensive	15	24	16	30	28	-
Better source of energy; the source of energy of the future	13	13	16	16	6	4
Clean energy; less pollution than oil, coal, gas	10	15	8	24	28	-
Make U.S. self-sufficient, independent of foreign energy sources	9	12	2	22	13	-
Unlimited, abundant supply; lasts indefinitely	8	8	6	26	21	-
Produces more power; more efficient, dependable, higher output	5	8	2	10	2	4
Favor it if there are proper controls; as long as it's safe, handled carefully	4	6	12	12	15	6
Think, have heard it's safe; don't believe it's dangerous	3	6	4	12	4	-
Less expensive in long run; after large initial outlay, it will cost less	3	*	6	2	2	4
Creates jobs	2	2	-	-	-	-
Better than strip mining	*	*	2	-	-	-
Nuclear energy necessary until development of solar, new kinds of energy	-	-	8	6	6	2
Our civilization, way of life depends on ample electric power	-	-	4	2	4	2
Extends availability of fossil fuels, for transport, other uses	-	-	-	4	4	-
Development of breeder reactors	-	-	-	-	4	-
All other answers	3	3	4	4	-	2

Table 40
REASONS WHY OPPOSE THE BUILDING OF MORE NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS IN THE UNITED STATES

Reasons Why Oppose (Base: Those who oppose)	Total Public %	Total Nucplant Neighbors %	Political Leaders %	Business Leaders %	Regulators %	Environmentalists %
	(19%)	(23%)	(29%)	(6%)	(19%)	(77%)
It's dangerous, unsafe; hazard to health; I'm afraid of it	10	12	24	4	17	52
Should find other sources of energy	3	2	-	2	-	21
Scientists don't know enough about it	3	4	12	-	4	15
Problems with radioactive wastes; no way to dispose of wastes	3	3	16	2	15	54
Danger of accident, malfunction; no system is foolproof; don't take proper precautions	3	5	2	2	6	13
Radiation leakage, contamination dangers	3	5	8	2	6	27
Causes air pollution; damages environment	2	3	6	-	4	2
Too expensive	2	3	6	-	2	12
Causes thermal pollution, hot water problems; kills marine life	1	3	-	-	2	-
Don't need more power plants; have enough already	1	4	-	-	-	-
Danger of sabotage	*	*	2	-	4	23
Controlled by politicians, special interest groups; not the people	*	2	2	-	4	8
Will lead to military-industrial complex control	-	-	-	-	2	13
All other answers	3	3	-	-	-	-

Table 41

FAVOR/OPPOSE THE BUILDING OF MORE NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS IN THE UNITED STATES

	Total Public %	Estimate of Public Opinion by:			
		<u>Politi- cal Leaders</u> %	<u>Busi- ness Leaders</u> %	<u>Regu- lators</u> %	<u>Environ- mental- ists</u> %
Favor	63	42	36	45	38
Oppose	19	38	48	40	34
Not sure	18	20	16	15	28

Q.7e(1)

Table 42

PERSONALLY FAVOR/OPPOSE HAVING NUCLEAR POWER AS MAIN SOURCE OF ENERGY
FOR ELECTRIC POWER IN YOUR COMMUNITY

	<u>Favor</u> %	<u>Oppose</u> %	<u>Not Sure</u> %
<u>Total Public</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>22</u>
East	49	30	21
Midwest	57	25	18
South	53	19	28
West	56	23	21
Cities	53	26	21
Suburbs	60	24	16
Towns	51	26	23
Rural	50	22	28
18-29 years	54	26	20
30-49 years	59	22	19
50 years and over	50	24	26
Some H.S. or less	46	23	31
H.S. grad/some college	59	24	17
College grad	57	29	14
Under \$5,000	35	28	37
\$5,000-\$9,999	52	24	24
\$10,000-\$14,999	57	23	20
\$15,000 and over	64	23	13
White	56	25	19
Black	39	26	35
Men	66	21	13
Women	43	27	30
Nucplants are safe	72	16	12
Nucplants not safe	15	68	17
<u>Total Nucplant Neighbors</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>22</u>	<u>17</u>
Indian Point, N.Y.	54	30	16
Morris, Ill.	57	25	18
San Onofre, Calif.	72	11	17

Q.7f

Table 43

WHY FAVOR HAVING NUCLEAR POWER AS MAIN SOURCE OF ENERGY
FOR ELECTRIC POWER IN YOUR COMMUNITY

	Total Public %	Total Nucplant Neigh- bors %	Poli- tical Leaders %	Busi- ness Leaders %	Regu- lators %	Environ- mental- ists %
Reasons Why Favor (Base: Those who favor)	(54%)	(61%)	(57%)	(88%)	(68%)	(22%)
Would be a cheaper, more economical source of power; would lower my electric bills	24	32	14	45	30	10
It's a cleaner source of energy; less polluting	13	20	8	27	32	8
It's available, abundant; unlimited source	8	8	10	20	19	6
Nuclear energy is new; it's power source of future	6	6	6	16	4	-
I favor it as long as it's safe	6	2	12	6	13	6
Would solve energy crisis, shortage	5	2	8	6	4	-
Makes us more independent; won't have to rely on foreign energy sources	4	5	8	10	11	-
It's necessary; we'll run out of energy otherwise	4	7	4	8	15	4
It's more reliable, dependable	3	5	6	12	6	4
Plants would help create more jobs	3	4	2	-	2	4
Helps conserve natural resources (e.g., coal, oil)	3	1	-	2	-	-
I have no objections to it	2	5	8	4	2	6
Efficient source of power	2	2	2	2	-	-
Can supply power for greater number of people; larger areas	1	2	-	-	-	-
Source of energy for future growth in the region	-	-	2	-	-	-
All other answers	3	5	4	6	6	2

Q.7f

Table 43

WHY OPPOSE HAVING NUCLEAR POWER AS MAIN SOURCE OF ENERGY
FOR ELECTRIC POWER IN YOUR COMMUNITY (continued)

	Total Public %	Total Nucplant Neigh- bors %	Politi- cal Leaders %	Busi- ness Leaders %	Regu- lators %	Environ- mental- ists %
Reasons Why Oppose (Base: Those who oppose)	(24%)	(22%)	(39%)	(6%)	(32%)	(76%)
It's dangerous, hazardous to community	10	8	31	6	13	48
Should use other, alternative available energy sources	5	2	6	-	2	6
Radiation, possible contamination, leakage, fall-out	3	8	6	-	2	8
I'm afraid of them; don't want them in community	3	4	4	2	-	2
Don't need power plant here; have enough power	3	1	2	-	-	2
Risks of accidents, explosions	3	5	-	2	6	27
Water, thermal pollution	2	3	2	-	4	4
Cost too much to build plants	2	1	4	-	-	10
Problem of disposing of waste properly	1	3	14	2	9	31
Prefer solar energy	1	1	2	2	-	2
Rather use land for parks, other uses	*	1	-	-	-	-
Inadequate engineering, technical capacity	-	-	14	-	9	29
Expensive	-	-	8	-	2	8
Morally opposed; would lead to fascism; warp our institutions	-	-	-	-	4	12
Shouldn't be dependent on one source of energy; need balance	-	-	4	2	6	-
All other answers	3	4	-	-	2	12

Q.12a

Table 44

CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH WOULD FAVOR OR OPPOSE
A NUCLEAR POWER PLANT LOCATED IN YOUR AREA

	Total Public %	Nucplant in Own Community		
		Favor %	Oppose %	Not Sure %
<u>If it were located offshore or in a place where not many people live</u>				
Favor	74	93	45	55
Oppose	14	3	43	5
Not sure	12	4	12	40
<u>If a special report of scientists said it was safe to be built and to be operated</u>				
Favor	73	93	42	55
Oppose	13	2	41	5
Not sure	14	5	17	40
<u>If it meant that electric power rates would not be going up for many years</u>				
Favor	72	90	44	59
Oppose	15	5	44	6
Not sure	13	5	12	35
<u>If it meant new industry would be attracted here, which would provide more jobs</u>				
Favor	69	90	39	52
Oppose	16	4	47	7
Not sure	15	6	14	41
<u>If Ralph Nader opposed it</u>				
Favor	39	61	13	10
Oppose	28	14	63	19
Not sure	33	25	24	71

(Continued)

(Continued)

Q.12a

Table 44

CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH PUBLIC WOULD FAVOR OR OPPOSE
A NUCLEAR POWER PLANT LOCATED IN YOUR AREA
(Continued)

	Total Public %	Nucplant in Own Community		
		Favor %	Oppose %	Not Sure %
<u>If your local government opposed it</u>				
Favor	37	58	10	11
Oppose	41	25	77	39
Not sure	22	17	13	50
<u>If your state government opposed it</u>				
Favor	35	55	12	10
Oppose	42	28	77	37
Not sure	23	18	11	53
<u>If it were declared by environmentalists to have a bad polluting effect on the environment</u>				
Favor	23	37	4	7
Oppose	61	48	88	60
Not sure	16	15	8	33
<u>If it were reported as unsafe by federal government regulatory agencies</u>				
Favor	12	18	4	6
Oppose	77	73	91	68
Not sure	11	9	5	26

Q.12a(1)

Table 45

CIRCUMSTANCES UNDER WHICH "FAVOR" A NUCLEAR POWER PLANT
LOCATED IN YOUR AREA

	Total Public %	Total Nucplant Neigh- bors %	Poli- tical Leaders %	Busi- ness Leaders %	Regu- lators %	Environ- mental- ists %
If it were located offshore or in a place where not many people live	74	75	63	90	77	22
If a special report of scientists said it was safe to be built and to be operated	73	75	68	94	79	21
If it meant that electric power rates would not be going up for many years	72	70	63	92	74	19
If it meant new industry would be attracted here, which would provide more jobs	69	63	63	88	62	12
<u>Favor your community building a nuclear power plant unconditionally</u>	<u>55</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>84</u>	<u>62</u>	<u>18</u>
If Ralph Nader opposed it	39	45	53	88	68	10
If your local government opposed it	37	41	47	80	66	10
If your state government opposed it	35	37	43	78	53	10
If it were declared by environmentalists to have a bad polluting effect on the environment	23	22	37	67	54	6
If it were reported as unsafe by federal government regulatory agencies	12	12	8	8	-	-

Q.8b(1)

Table 46
LIKELIHOOD OF CERTAIN CONSEQUENCES OF THE BUILDING
OF NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS IN OWN COMMUNITY

	Total Public %	Nucplant in Own Community	
		Favor %	Oppose %
<u>More new business would come to the community and create more jobs</u>			
More likely	67	77	56
Less likely	11	9	19
No real change (vol.)	12	10	16
Not sure	10	4	9
<u>Electric power would be a better buy for the money</u>			
More likely	61	80	43
Less likely	12	8	25
No real change (vol.)	10	5	16
Not sure	17	7	16
<u>The community would be a better place to find a job</u>			
More likely	58	72	43
Less likely	11	7	22
No real change (vol.)	17	15	22
Not sure	14	6	13
<u>There would be less air pollution</u>			
More likely	57	76	35
Less likely	14	8	31
No real change (vol.)	9	7	14
Not sure	20	9	20
<u>There would be less water pollution</u>			
More likely	43	61	23
Less likely	21	14	40
No real change (vol.)	12	10	15
Not sure	24	15	22
<u>The community would be a better place to live</u>			
More likely	42	62	16
Less likely	17	7	43
No real change (vol.)	23	24	26
Not sure	18	7	15
<u>You would want to stay in the community for a longer time than before</u>			
More likely	32	48	10
Less likely	17	6	43
No real change (vol.)	35	38	33
Not sure	16	8	14

Q.8b

Table 47

LIKELIHOOD OF CERTAIN CONSEQUENCES
OF THE BUILDING OF NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS IN OWN COMMUNITY

	Total Public %	Total Nucplant Neigh- bors %	Poli- tical Leaders %	Busi- ness Leaders %	Regu- lators %	Environ- mental- ists %
<u>More new business would come to the community and create more jobs</u>						
More likely	67	43	43	51	47	16
Less likely	11	14	22	14	23	46
No real change (vol.)	12	25	29	31	28	34
Not sure	10	18	6	4	2	4
<u>Electric power would be a better buy for the money</u>						
More likely	61	42	53	82	60	25
Less likely	12	16	27	10	23	50
No real change (vol.)	10	25	16	6	11	19
Not sure	17	17	4	2	6	6
<u>The community would be a better place to find a job</u>						
More likely	58	37	42	49	38	10
Less likely	11	16	18	10	17	48
No real change (vol.)	17	30	40	35	36	37
Not sure	14	17	-	6	9	5
<u>There would be less air pollution</u>						
More likely	57	44	72	86	72	58
Less likely	14	15	14	6	9	27
No real change (vol.)	9	26	10	8	15	12
Not sure	20	15	4	-	4	3
<u>There would be less water pollution</u>						
More likely	43	35	47	57	39	23
Less likely	21	26	33	16	33	58
No real change (vol.)	12	21	10	22	22	13
Not sure	24	18	10	5	6	6
<u>The community would be a better place to live</u>						
More likely	42	28	36	47	38	15
Less likely	17	21	34	10	19	67
No real change (vol.)	23	37	28	35	38	15
Not sure	18	14	2	8	5	3
<u>You would want to stay in the community for a longer time than before</u>						
More likely	32	21	20	47	23	6
Less likely	17	18	28	6	17	63
No real change (vol.)	35	50	52	43	57	31
Not sure	16	11	-	4	3	-

Table 48

WHETHER IT WOULD BE WORTHWHILE TO HAVE A NUCLEAR POWER PLANT
IN OWN COMMUNITY IF IT MEANT THAT ELECTRIC POWER RATES WOULD BE . . .
("Worthwhiles" only)

	<u>Total Public %</u>	<u>Total Nucplant Neigh- bors %</u>	<u>Poli- tical Leaders %</u>	<u>Busi- ness Leaders %</u>	<u>Regu- lators %</u>	<u>Environ- mental- ists %</u>
20% more than other types of power	24	20	28	45	36	17
10% more than other types of power	31	26	33	61	51	19
About the same as other types of power	55	54	48	90	65	19
10% less than other types of power	70	69	63	92	72	25
15% less than other types of power	75	73	63	94	72	25
25% less than other types of power	80	80	74	94	79	27
50% less than other types of power	83	84	78	94	81	29

Table 49

7m(1)

WHETHER IT WOULD BE WORTHWHILE TO HAVE A NUCLEAR POWER PLANT
IN OWN COMMUNITY IF IT MEANT THAT ELECTRIC POWER RATES WOULD BE
('Worthwhiles" only)

	20% More Than Other Types of Power %	10% More Than Other Types of Power %	About The Same as Other Types of Power %	10% Less Than Other Types of Power %	15% Less Than Other Types of Power %	25% Less Than Other Types of Power %	50% Less Than Other Types of Power %
<u>Total Public</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>31</u>	<u>55</u>	<u>70</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>80</u>	<u>83</u>
East	20	25	44	62	68	75	79
Midwest	22	31	59	73	76	79	83
South	24	29	57	76	80	85	87
West	33	43	61	70	75	80	84
Cities	29	35	53	68	74	80	83
Suburbs	23	29	54	70	73	79	84
Towns	24	34	60	73	75	77	79
Rural	20	27	56	72	77	83	86
18-29 years	31	38	61	76	79	82	85
30-49 years	23	31	54	70	74	82	86
50 years and over	20	26	51	67	72	76	80
Under \$5,000	20	24	48	64	68	74	79
\$5,000-\$9,999	23	29	51	68	75	83	85
\$10,000-\$14,999	25	34	61	74	77	82	84
\$15,000 and over	27	34	57	73	76	80	83
Favor nucplant in own community	35	45	72	87	90	94	95
Oppose nucplant in own community	9	13	32	47	53	60	68

SECTION IV:

IMPACT OF INSTITUTIONS AND INDIVIDUALS
ON NUCLEAR POWER

Tables 50, 51

For the final word on nuclear energy, the public looks not to environmentalists, not to government leaders, and not to the media. Instead only one group of people commands "a great deal of confidence" from a majority of the public -- scientists. In fact, scientists inspire confidence in people on both sides of the fence: those who favor more nuclear plants in the United States (64% have "a great deal of confidence") and those who are opposed (53%).

Leadership agrees with the public here: "on matters concerning nuclear energy development", no group or institution apart from scientists instills a great deal of confidence in a majority of leaders. (There is one exception here: a majority of environmentalists turn to "leading environmentalists" for the final word on nuclear energy.)

"A GREAT DEAL" OF CONFIDENCE IN WHAT VARIOUS PEOPLE OR GROUPS SAY
ON MATTERS CONCERNING NUCLEAR ENERGY DEVELOPMENT

	<u>Total Public</u> %	<u>Poli- tical Leaders</u> %	<u>Busi- ness Leaders</u> %	<u>Regu- lators</u> %	<u>Environ- mental- ists</u> %
Scientists	58	63	71	62	37
Nuclear Regulatory Commission (formerly Atomic Energy Commission)	38	31	49	38	6
Energy Research and Development Administration	35	37	39	32	6
Leading environmentalists	26	22	8	13	57
The President of the United States	24	20	39	24	8
News commentators on television	22	2	2	6	8
News commentators in newspapers	18	8	2	6	8
Heads of electric power companies	18	12	39	7	2
Foundation reports	17	36	14	37	27
State governors	9	12	-	4	6
U.S. Senators	8	2	-	-	4
U.S. Congressmen	7	2	-	-	2
Ads in newspapers by those who support nuclear power	7	-	4	2	-
Labor union leaders	7	-	-	2	8
Ads in newspapers by those who oppose nuclear power	6	-	-	-	14

On matters concerning nuclear energy development scientists are followed by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (38% of the public have "a great deal of confidence") and the Energy Research and Development Administration (35%). On nuclear energy matters, the public trusts leading environmentalists more than news commentators, U.S. Senators and Congressmen, the heads of electric power companies, and even the President. Confidence in the heads of electric power companies runs low among all groups but business leaders, 39% of whom have "a great deal of confidence" in electric company management.

Trust in the Media

Table 52 "In reporting the facts on nuclear power development impartially and not slanted", some media command more confidence than others. The lead here is held by the network TV news and the news magazines, selected by 25% and 22% of the public respectively as the most trusted source. Among leaders, network news loses its stature and is replaced by daily newspapers, news magazines and magazines in general as trusted sources of impartial facts on nuclear power development.

Influence of Friends and Critics of Nuclear Energy

Table 53 In winning favor for nuclear energy, the successors of the Atomic Energy Commission can be counted on as the most effective spokesmen. Thirty-six percent of the public say that the Atomic Energy Commission "makes (them) more in favor" of nuclear power plants.

The administration's support for the building of more nuclear power plants can be expected to have some positive effect on public opinion: 22% of the public say that President Ford's position makes them more in favor of

nuclear power plants, and 14% say that Vice President Rockefeller's position has the same effect. As with the Atomic Energy Commission, support by the President and Vice President would have more of a negative than a positive impact on environmentalists.

Support by any of the three Senators mentioned -- that is, Senators Jackson, Baker or Pastore -- would have only a minimal positive effect on public attitudes toward nuclear power. Support by Senator Jackson or Baker would tend to make political leaders and business leaders slightly more favorable to nuclear power. In addition, support by Senator Pastore would make one in five business leaders more favorable.

Table 54

In gaining public opposition to nuclear energy, environmental groups and Ralph Nader are the most effective spokesmen. Twenty-seven percent of the public say that the stand of environmental groups "makes (them) more opposed", and 20% say the same about Ralph Nader. Environmental groups and Ralph Nader have by far their biggest influence over the attitudes of environmentalists themselves. Business leaders would respond differently, however; if anything, the opposition of environmental groups and Ralph Nader would make business leaders more favorable to nuclear energy.

Opposition on the part of the Sierra Club would go a long way to make environmentalists more opposed but have only minimal effect on the attitudes of the public at large. Similarly, opposition to nuclear power on the part of Senators such as Senators Proxmire, Ribicoff and Hart would have an insignificant impact on public opinion. These three Senators would successfully increase opposition to nuclear power among political leaders and environmentalists, but if anything decrease what opposition there is among business leaders.

Observation:

On matters related to nuclear energy, the public turns with greater confidence to scientists than to any other public or private group. Among the media, television network news and news magazines enjoy the greatest public credibility in reporting the facts on nuclear power development.

The public does not admit easily to being swayed in its opinions on nuclear energy. It is evident that the most effective spokesmen in favor of nuclear energy are the federal successors of the Atomic Energy Commission and, to a lesser extent, President Ford; while the most effective opponents are environmental groups and Ralph Nader.

Confidence in Electric Power Companies

Table 55 Twenty-three percent of the public express "a great deal" of confidence in the people running electric power companies. Confidence in the management of electric power companies has slipped seven points since it was last measured in January of 1974. Confidence in all major institutions is at a record low these days. The electric power companies are surpassed only by higher education (36% "a great deal") and television news (34%) as institutions which command public confidence. Opponents of nuclear energy -- Ralph Nader and environmentalist groups -- command no more or less confidence than electric power companies. Noticeably lower on the list, however, are state commissions which regulate electric power companies; only 12% of the public have a great deal of confidence in these commissions.

Table 57 Confidence in electric power companies runs equally high among political leaders (20% "a great deal") and among regulators (28%), as it does among the public at large. Business leaders (41%) have far more trust than any other group in people who run electric power companies, while

environmentalists (4%) have little faith at all in the management of these companies.

Table 58

In two areas in particular, local electric power companies receive a strong vote of confidence. By 82 to 17%, the public gives them positive ratings on "providing good service" (even the environmentalists give them positive ratings on this count). By 82 to 14%, the public gives local electric power companies positive ratings on "always having enough electricity to meet expanding local needs". Once again, all the leadership groups surveyed agree with the public, although positive ratings run somewhat lower among environmentalists.

On "finding new sources of energy to produce more electric power" the public's rating of their local electric power companies is less sanguine. On finding new sources of energy "which will be less expensive", the scale tips to the negative side. By 42 to 33%, the public feels local power companies have not done a good job here. Furthermore, by 50 to 47%, the public gives local power companies negative ratings on "giving good value for the money".

Observation:

While the public credits local power companies with providing good service and adequate supplies of electricity, electric power companies are not credited with much concern for the consumer's pocketbook. Given the public's views that nuclear power provides a cheaper form of electricity, efforts on the part of electric companies to develop nuclear power may go a long way in convincing the public that they are committed to economical electricity as well.

The Pollution Issue

Table 59 There is no question that electric utility companies, like all branches of the public and private sectors, will be judged today on the job they do in curbing air and water pollution. Public perceptions of the seriousness of the pollution problem have shifted since January 1975: sixty percent view water pollution as "very serious" now, compared with 51% who felt that way in January 1975. Similarly, 57% consider air pollution as "very serious" now, compared with 46% in January.

Table 60 Majorities of all leadership groups but one judge both air and water pollution to be "very serious". Only business leaders are less alarmed over the seriousness of pollution problems. All leadership groups, Table 61 however, tend to underestimate public concern over air and water pollution.

Table 62 "In attempting to curb air and water pollution in this country", electric utility companies receive a 54 to 36% negative rating from the public at large. Political leaders, regulators and environmentalists are even harsher critics of the job electric companies have done in this area. Only business leaders judge them positively here.

Compared with other sectors of private industry, however, electric utility companies fare rather well. Small industrial plants, large industrial plants, oil companies and coal producers all receive even more negative ratings than the electric power companies on their attempts to curb air and water pollution. In addition, all branches of government -- local, state and federal -- receive negative scores on their attempts here. The environmental protection groups alone are credited by the public with doing a good job in fighting pollution.

Observation:

If the case can in fact be made that nuclear energy is a cleaner energy source than fossil fuels, this asset will go a long way in winning public support for nuclear power development. In large part this battle has been won, since the public expressed earlier its belief that nuclear energy is indeed cleaner than coal or oil.

Financing Nuclear Development

Table 63

On the whole, the electric power companies are felt to be doing a good job in providing adequate electricity and finding new sources of energy to produce more electric power. Companies that opt for nuclear power as a new source of energy are faced with high costs. One possible way to finance the high costs of building nuclear power plants might be through tax-free bonds. By 48% to 25% (with 27% undecided), the public would favor "giving private power companies the right to sell tax-free bonds, with the interest paid to bondholders tax-free as with municipal bonds, to finance the high costs it takes to finance new nuclear power plants."

Business leaders (by 73% to 27%) and regulators (by 55% to 43%) would also be in favor of allowing private power companies to float tax-free bonds to finance the costs of new plants. Political leaders and environmentalists express their opposition to such bonds.

Role of Government in Nuclear Energy

Although the public is in favor of government enforcement of strict safety regulations and precautions, by no means does the public opt for nationalization of either the nuclear power business, the electric utilities industry or industry in general for that matter. Contrary to what business leaders anticipate (60% of business leaders expect the public to favor the federal government's taking over electric utilities which are in serious financial trouble), only minorities of the public favor government-operated business.

Table 66

Table 65

-- By 83% to 10%, the public opposes the federal government's "taking over most big business." Leaders are unanimously opposed to this.

-- By 78% to 13%, the public is against the government's "creating a big business company to compete with private industry." Opposition here has increased by fourteen points over the past year.

-- By 74% to 17%, the public opposes the federal government's "taking over all electric utilities." Opposition runs much higher here among political leaders (82% opposed), business leaders (96%) and regulators (94%), but lower again among environmentalists (65%).

-- By 52% to 36%, the public is against the government's "taking over electric utilities which are in serious financial trouble." Again, opposition here runs much higher among all leaders apart from environmentalists.

-- Despite the high prices of gasoline, there is strong public opposition (by 63% to 24%) to a government-owned oil corporation. Most opposed here are business leaders and regulators.

-- Likewise, the public (by 61% to 25%) would be opposed to "creating a government-owned nuclear power company to own and run all nuclear power plants." Three out of four political leaders and environmentalists, and nine in ten business leaders and regulators, would oppose nationalization of the nuclear power industry.

Observation:

There is deep distrust among the American public of government control of private industry.

Despite low confidence in the oil companies, for example, the public would still oppose a government-owned oil corporation. The public is turning to the government for regulation of the development of nuclear energy and would support tax-free bonds to finance it. Nonetheless, the public chooses to leave the ownership and operation of nuclear power plants in the hands of the private sector.

Q.10e

Table 50

PUBLIC TRUST AND CONFIDENCE IN WHAT VARIOUS PEOPLE OR GROUPS SAY
ON MATTERS CONCERNING NUCLEAR ENERGY DEVELOPMENT

	Total Public			
	A	Only Some Confidence	Hardly Any Confidence	Not Sure
	Great Deal Confidence		At All	
	%	%	%	%
Scientists	58	32	5	5
Nuclear Regulatory Commission (formerly Atomic Energy Commission)	38	38	13	11
Energy Research and Development Administration	35	39	11	15
Leading environmentalists	26	50	15	9
The President of the United States	24	47	25	4
News commentators on television	22	53	20	5
News commentators in newspapers	18	55	22	5
Heads of electric power companies	18	41	34	7
Foundation reports	17	44	18	21
State governors	9	51	35	5
U.S. Senators	8	51	36	5
U.S. Congressmen	7	52	36	5
Ads in newspapers by those who support nuclear power	7	42	39	12
Labor union leaders	7	38	46	9
Ads in newspapers by those who oppose nuclear power	6	38	44	12

Q.10e(1)

Table 51

"A GREAT DEAL" OF CONFIDENCE IN WHAT VARIOUS PEOPLE OR GROUPS SAY
ON MATTERS CONCERNING NUCLEAR ENERGY DEVELOPMENT

	Total Public %	Favor More Nucplants in U.S. %	Oppose More Nucplants in U.S. %
Scientists	58	64	53
Nuclear Regulatory Commission (formerly Atomic Energy Commission)	38	48	20
Energy Research and Development Administration	35	44	21
Leading environmentalists	26	23	41
The President of the United States	24	28	11
News commentators on television	22	23	25
News commentators in newspapers	18	18	20
Heads of electric power companies	18	22	9
Foundation reports	17	21	11
State governors	9	8	7
U.S. Senators	8	8	6
U.S. Congressmen	7	7	6
Ads in newspapers by those who support nuclear power	7	9	4
Labor union leaders	7	8	5
Ads in newspapers by those who oppose nuclear power	6	4	11

Q.10a,b,c,d

Table 52

TRUST IN COMMUNICATIONS MEDIA

	Network TV News %	Television in General %	Daily Newspaper %	News Magazines %	Radio %	Magazines in General %	Not Sure %
<u>Trust most to report facts impartially and not slanted</u>							
<u>Total Public</u>	34	19	14	13	9	3	8
Political leaders	14	2	45	27	2	2	8
Business leaders	14	4	20	30	18	8	6
Regulators	20	2	20	38	9	4	7
Environmentalists	10	2	44	18	-	14	12
<u>Best job in reporting in full on energy shortage</u>							
<u>Total Public</u>	31	18	16	17	5	2	11
Political leaders	2	2	45	35	-	10	6
Business leaders	4	2	20	50	-	16	8
Regulators	11	9	17	55	-	4	4
Environmentalists	4	4	46	31	-	13	2
<u>Best job of reporting in full on environmental protection matters</u>							
<u>Total Public</u>	23	19	16	18	4	7	13
Political leaders	2	4	42	22	-	22	8
Business leaders	2	10	16	46	-	20	6
Regulators	6	2	36	36	-	11	9
Environmentalists	-	2	50	21	-	23	4
<u>Trust most in reporting the facts on nuclear power development impartially and not slanted</u>							
<u>Total Public</u>	25	15	14	22	4	4	16
Political leaders	2	4	38	33	2	13	8
Business leaders	2	6	8	40	4	25	15
Regulators	4	2	16	51	-	11	16
Environmentalists	6	8	34	20	-	26	6

Table 53

WHETHER PEOPLE AND GROUPS IN FAVOR OF NUCLEAR ENERGY
MAKE YOU FEEL MORE OR LESS IN FAVOR OF NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS

	Total Public %	Total Nucplant Neigh- bors %	Poli- tical Leaders %	Busi- ness Leaders %	Regu- lators %	Environ- mental- ists %
<u>The Atomic Energy Commission</u>						
Makes me more in favor	36	35	22	47	34	2
Less in favor	7	8	18	4	17	42
Not much difference	50	50	59	49	47	56
Not sure	7	7	1	-	2	-
Net effect	+29	+27	+4	+43	+17	-40
<u>President Gerald Ford</u>						
Makes me more in favor	22	25	12	20	15	6
Less in favor	8	8	2	-	2	29
Not much difference	65	63	84	80	83	65
Not sure	5	4	2	-	-	-
Net effect	+14	+17	+10	+20	+13	-23
<u>Vice President Nelson Rockefeller</u>						
Makes me more in favor	14	18	18	16	7	2
Less in favor	7	6	4	2	4	35
Not much difference	71	68	78	80	89	62
Not sure	8	8	-	2	-	1
Net effect	+7	+12	+14	+14	+3	-33
<u>Sen. Henry Jackson of Washington</u>						
Makes me more in favor	11	13	20	14	6	6
Less in favor	4	4	6	2	2	25
Not much difference	74	71	73	82	91	67
Not sure	11	12	1	2	1	2
Net effect	+7	+9	+14	+12	+4	-19
<u>Sen. Howard Baker of Tennessee</u>						
Makes me more in favor	9	12	16	22	6	10
Less in favor	4	4	4	-	-	15
Not much difference	74	72	78	76	91	73
Not sure	13	12	2	2	3	2
Net effect	+5	+8	+12	+22	+6	-5
<u>Sen. John Pastore of Rhode Island</u>						
Makes me more in favor	5	10	12	18	2	4
Less in favor	4	4	6	-	4	10
Not much difference	77	72	80	80	91	83
Not sure	14	14	2	2	3	3
Net effect	+1	+6	+6	+18	-2	-6

Q.9a

Table 54

WHETHER PEOPLE AND GROUPS OPPOSED TO NUCLEAR ENERGY
MAKE YOU FEEL MORE OR LESS OPPOSED TO NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS

	Total Public %	Total Nucplant Neigh- bors %	Poli- tical Leaders %	Busi- ness Leaders %	Regu- lators %	Environ- mental- ists %
<u>Environmentalists Groups</u>						
Make me more opposed	27	27	18	10	20	65
Less opposed	7	11	2	20	4	2
Not much difference	56	54	76	70	76	33
Not sure	10	8	4	-	-	-
Net effect	+20	+16	+16	-10	+16	+63
<u>Ralph Nader</u>						
Make me more opposed	20	19	20	6	15	61
Less opposed	6	8	12	31	9	2
Not much difference	62	65	67	63	76	37
Not sure	12	8	1	-	-	-
Net effect	+14	+11	+8	-25	+6	+59
<u>The Sierra Club</u>						
Make me more opposed	12	14	18	10	17	60
Less opposed	4	8	4	14	11	2
Not much difference	65	61	75	75	72	38
Not sure	19	17	3	1	-	-
Net effect	+8	+6	+14	-4	+6	+58
<u>Sen. William Proxmire of Wisconsin</u>						
Makes me more opposed	9	9	27	8	11	48
Less opposed	6	6	6	24	9	2
Not much difference	72	71	63	67	80	50
Not sure	13	14	4	1	-	-
Net effect	+3	+3	+21	-16	+2	+46
<u>Sen. Abraham Ribicoff of Connecticut</u>						
Makes me more opposed	7	8	24	10	9	46
Less opposed	5	6	2	14	9	2
Not much difference	73	70	71	73	82	52
Not sure	15	16	3	3	-	-
Net effect	+2	+2	+22	-4	-	+44
<u>Senator Philip Hart of Michigan</u>						
Makes me more opposed	6	6	29	2	7	54
Less opposed	4	4	4	18	2	2
Not much difference	73	70	63	78	87	42
Not sure	17	20	4	2	4	2
Net effect	+2	+2	+25	-16	+5	+52

Q.4c

Table 55

"A GREAT DEAL" OF CONFIDENCE IN PEOPLE RUNNING INSTITUTIONS

	<u>April</u> <u>1975</u> %	<u>Sept.</u> <u>1974</u> %	<u>Jan.</u> <u>1974</u> %	<u>Sept.</u> <u>1973</u> %	<u>1972</u> %	<u>1971</u> %	<u>1966</u> %
Higher education	36	40	45	44	33	37	61
Television news	34	32	36	41	17	22	25
The military	25	29	X	40	35	27	62
Ralph Nader	25	X	X	X	X	X	X
The press	24	25	28	30	18	18	29
Electric power companies	23	X	30	X	X	X	X
Environmentalist groups	21	X	X	X	X	X	X
Atomic Energy Commission	20	X	X	X	X	X	X
Major companies	18	15	28	29	27	27	55
Labor unions	16	18	16	20	15	14	22
The White House	13	18	14	19	27	23	41
State commissions which regulate electric power companies	12	X	X	X	X	X	X
Congress	11	16	17	29	27	19	42
Oil companies	8	X	9	20	X	X	X

Q.4c

Table 56

CONFIDENCE IN PEOPLE RUNNING INSTITUTIONS

	Total Public			
	Great Deal of Confidence %	Only Some Confidence %	Hardly Any Confidence %	Not Sure %
Higher education	36	44	15	5
Television news	34	50	14	2
The military	25	42	26	7
Ralph Nader	25	35	19	21
The press	24	50	22	4
Electric power companies	23	50	23	4
Environmental groups	21	46	19	14
Atomic Energy Commission	20	43	16	21
Major companies	18	48	29	5
Labor unions	16	41	33	10
The White House	13	45	38	4
State commission which regulate electric power companies	12	40	32	16
Congress	11	51	34	4
Oil companies	8	34	53	5

Table 57
CONFIDENCE IN PEOPLE RUNNING INSTITUTIONS

	Total Public %	Total Nucplant Neighbors %	Political Leaders %	Business Leaders %	Regulators %	Environmentalists %
<u>Ralph Nader</u>						
Great deal of confidence	25	25	22	10	15	63
Only some	35	36	48	33	49	29
Hardly any	19	22	30	57	36	8
Not sure	21	17	-	-	-	-
<u>Electric Power Companies</u>						
Great deal of confidence	23	27	20	41	28	4
Only some	50	52	64	53	62	35
Hardly any	23	18	16	6	6	61
Not sure	4	3	-	-	4	-
<u>Environmental Groups</u>						
Great deal of confidence	21	29	24	8	15	58
Only some	46	43	64	45	62	33
Hardly any	19	20	12	47	23	8
Not sure	14	8	-	-	-	1
<u>Atomic Energy Commission</u>						
Great deal of confidence	20	26	22	37	21	6
Only some	43	38	49	49	57	24
Hardly any	16	13	27	10	13	68
Not sure	21	23	2	4	9	2
<u>State Commission Which Regulate Electric Power Companies</u>						
Great deal of confidence	12	14	12	2	21	4
Only some	40	44	45	69	55	31
Hardly any	32	26	35	27	21	63
Not sure	16	16	8	2	3	2
<u>Oil Companies</u>						
Great deal of confidence	8	11	27	39	17	-
Only some	34	33	33	45	55	35
Hardly any	53	51	39	14	23	65
Not sure	5	5	1	2	5	-

RATINGS OF JOB DONE BY LOCAL ELECTRIC POWER COMPANY

	<u>Total Public</u> %	<u>Total Nucplant Neighbors</u> %	<u>Political Leaders</u> %	<u>Business Leaders</u> %	<u>Regulators</u> %	<u>Environmentalists</u> %
<u>Providing Good Service</u>						
Positive	82	85	76	86	94	62
Negative	17	14	18	14	4	35
Not sure	1	1	6	-	2	3
<u>Always Having Enough Electricity to Meet Expanding Local Needs</u>						
Positive	82	86	84	82	87	69
Negative	14	11	10	18	9	18
Not sure	4	3	6	-	4	13
<u>Giving Good Value for the Money</u>						
Positive	47	44	52	69	67	42
Negative	50	53	40	29	26	50
Not sure	3	3	8	2	7	8
<u>Finding New Sources of Energy to Produce More Electric Power</u>						
Positive	41	46	47	64	39	10
Negative	34	32	49	30	54	79
Not sure	25	22	4	6	7	11
<u>Trying to Find New Sources of Energy for Electric Power Which Will Be Less Expensive</u>						
Positive	33	34	39	51	33	6
Negative	42	38	49	39	57	83
Not sure	25	28	12	10	10	11

Q.11a,b

Table 59

SERIOUSNESS OF WATER AND AIR POLLUTION

	April <u>1975</u> %	Jan. <u>1975</u> %	August <u>1973</u> %
<u>Water Pollution</u>			
Very serious	60	51	40
Only somewhat serious	32	35	27
Not serious at all	6	10	31
Not sure	2	4	2
<u>Air Pollution</u>			
Very serious	57	46	34
Only somewhat serious	34	39	30
Not serious at all	6	12	35
Not sure	3	3	1

Q.11a,b

Table 60

SERIOUSNESS OF WATER AND AIR POLLUTION IN THIS COUNTRY:

	<u>Total Public %</u>	<u>Politi- tical Leaders %</u>	<u>Busi- ness Leaders %</u>	<u>Regu- lators %</u>	<u>Environ- mental- ists %</u>
<u>Water Pollution</u>					
Very serious	60	63	47	68	69
Only somewhat serious	32	37	49	30	29
Not serious at all	6	-	4	2	-
Not sure	2	-	-	-	2
<u>Air Pollution</u>					
Very serious	57	61	30	55	79
Only somewhat serious	34	37	68	45	19
Not serious at all	6	2	2	-	2
Not sure	3	-	-	-	-

Q.17a,b

Table 61

SERIOUSNESS OF WATER AND AIR POLLUTION IN THIS COUNTRY

		Estimate of Public Opinion by:			
	Total Public	Poli- tical Leaders	Busi- ness Leaders	Regu- lators	Environ- mental- ists
	%	%	%	%	%
<u>Water Pollution</u>					
Very serious	60	24	40	38	37
Only somewhat serious	32	66	54	60	59
Not serious at all	6	10	4	2	4
Not sure	2	-	2	-	-
<u>Air Pollution</u>					
Very serious	57	36	40	38	44
Only somewhat serious	34	52	54	62	54
Not serious at all	6	12	4	-	2
Not sure	3	-	2	-	-

Table 62

RATING OF JOB DONE BY VARIOUS GROUPS
IN ATTEMPTING TO CURB AIR AND WATER POLLUTION IN THIS COUNTRY

	Total Public %	Politi- cal Leaders %	Busi- ness Leaders %	Regu- lators %	Environ- mental- ists %
<u>Environmental protection groups</u>					
Positive	52	76	43	59	71
Negative	38	24	53	39	25
Not sure	10	-	4	2	4
<u>Local government</u>					
Positive	40	25	43	38	22
Negative	54	75	57	60	76
Not sure	6	-	-	2	2
<u>Federal government</u>					
Positive	39	53	51	53	48
Negative	53	47	43	47	50
Not sure	8	-	6	-	2
<u>State government</u>					
Positive	36	43	43	55	14
Negative	54	57	53	45	84
Not sure	10	-	4	-	2
<u>Electric utility companies</u>					
Positive	36	20	63	34	12
Negative	54	80	37	66	88
Not sure	10	-	-	-	-
<u>Congress</u>					
Positive	28	47	24	47	60
Negative	61	53	76	53	40
Not sure	11	-	-	-	-
<u>The average citizen</u>					
Positive	27	16	10	6	19
Negative	68	84	88	91	81
Not sure	5	-	2	3	-
<u>Small industrial plants</u>					
Positive	25	16	14	30	6
Negative	63	80	82	68	75
Not sure	12	4	4	2	19
<u>Large industrial plants</u>					
Positive	25	16	63	47	13
Negative	66	82	35	53	81
Not sure	9	2	2	-	6

(Continued)

Q.11c

Table 62

RATING OF JOB DONE BY VARIOUS GROUPS
IN ATTEMPTING TO CURB AIR AND WATER POLLUTION IN THIS COUNTRY (Continued)

	Total Public %	Poli- tical Leaders %	Busi- ness Leaders %	Regu- lators %	Environ- mental- ists %
<u>Oil companies</u>					
Positive	21	14	45	26	6
Negative	68	86	55	74	92
Not sure	11	-	-	-	2
<u>Coal producers</u>					
Positive	18	4	20	9	-
Negative	63	92	76	85	98
Not sure	19	4	4	6	2

Q.12b

Table 63

FAVOR OR OPPOSE GIVING PRIVATE POWER COMPANIES THE RIGHT TO SELL
TAX-FREE BONDS, WITH THE INTEREST PAID TO BONDHOLDERS TAX-FREE AS
WITH MUNICIPAL BONDS, TO FINANCE THE HIGH COSTS IT TAKES TO
FINANCE NEW NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS

	<u>Favor</u> %	<u>Oppose</u> %	<u>Not Sure</u> %
<u>Total Public</u>	<u>48</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>27</u>
Favor more nucplants in U.S.	59	21	20
Oppose more nucplants in U.S.	26	49	25
<u>Political Leaders</u>	<u>35</u>	<u>61</u>	<u>4</u>
<u>Business Leaders</u>	<u>73</u>	<u>27</u>	<u>-</u>
<u>Regulators</u>	<u>55</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>2</u>
<u>Environmentalists</u>	<u>17</u>	<u>75</u>	<u>8</u>

Q.13(1)

Table 64

FAVOR OR OPPOSE POSSIBLE ACTIONS OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

	April 1975 %	July 1974 %
<u>Taking over most big business</u>		
Favor	10	11
Oppose	83	83
Not sure	7	6
<u>Creating a big business company to compete with private industry</u>		
Favor	13	26
Oppose	78	64
Not sure	9	10
<u>Taking over all electric utilities</u>		
Favor	17	X
Oppose	74	X
Not sure	9	X
<u>Taking over electric utilities which are in serious financial trouble</u>		
Favor	36	X
Oppose	52	X
Not sure	12	X
<u>Creating a government-owned oil corporation</u>		
Favor	24	26
Oppose	63	58
Not sure	13	16
<u>Creating a government-owned nuclear power company to own and run all nuclear power plants</u>		
Favor	25	X
Oppose	61	X
Not sure	14	X

Table 65

FAVOR OR OPPOSE POSSIBLE ACTIONS OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

	Total Public %	Politi- cal Leaders %	Busi- ness Leaders %	Regu- lators %	Environ- mental- ists %
<u>Taking over most big business</u>					
Favor	10	-	2	2	4
Oppose	83	98	98	98	92
Not sure	7	2	-	-	4
<u>Creating a big business company to compete with private industry</u>					
Favor	13	10	2	6	25
Oppose	78	86	98	94	67
Not sure	9	4	-	-	8
<u>Taking over all electric utilities</u>					
Favor	17	14	2	4	13
Oppose	74	82	96	94	65
Not sure	9	4	2	2	22
<u>Taking over electric utilities which are in serious financial trouble</u>					
Favor	36	22	12	15	31
Oppose	52	72	86	77	54
Not sure	12	6	2	8	15
<u>Creating a government-owned oil corporation</u>					
Favor	24	27	2	4	37
Oppose	63	65	92	91	47
Not sure	13	8	6	5	16
<u>Creating a government-owned nuclear power company to own and run all nuclear power plants</u>					
Favor	25	20	-	4	17
Oppose	61	74	96	91	75
Not sure	14	6	4	5	8

Q.18

Table 66

FAVOR OR OPPOSE POSSIBLE ACTIONS OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT
("Favor" only)

	Total Public %	Estimate of Public Opinion by:			
		Poli- tical Leaders %	Busi- ness Leaders %	Regu- lators %	Environ- mental- ists %
Taking over most big business	10	2	10	4	4
Creating a big business company to compete with private industry	13	8	26	4	13
Taking over all electric utilities	17	29	28	17	17
Taking over electric utilities which are in serious financial trouble	36	38	60	45	48
Creating a government-owned oil corporation	24	43	46	30	42
Creating a government-owned nuclear power company to own and run all nuclear power plants	25	39	40	17	27